

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. XLVI, No. 25
WHOLE No. 1174

March 26, 1932

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	585-588
EDITORIALS	
A Great Educator—Amendments and Counter Amendments—The God of Nations—Federal Misappropriations—The German Elections—On Alien Strands	589-591
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
The Fourth Word From the Cross—New Light on Mother Seton—The Blessing of Briand—Bowing the Knee to Burchard	592-598
EDUCATION	
Little Mary's Insides	598-599
ECONOMICS	
Marked Cards and Loaded Dice	600-601
POETRY	
A Woman of Jerusalem—The Resurrection Mysteries	601; 602
BACK OF BUSINESS	601
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF	603-604
DRAMATICS	
Moon in Yellow River is Spring Freshet of Words	604-606
REVIEWS	606-608
COMMUNICATIONS	608

Chronicle

Home News.—Representative Crisp, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, began the fight to pass the new tax bill on March 10. Almost immediately a revolt appeared in the ranks of the Democrats against the manufacturers' sales tax, which they realized would be extremely unpopular with their constituents and might seriously affect the chances of the Presidential nominee in November. This revolt was so serious that Chairman Raskob and Jouett Shouse used all of their power to force the recalcitrants into line. In spite of this, however, a Democratic bloc was formed under Congressman Doughton in a caucus to plan for the defeat of the sales tax. The Republican minority was said to be unanimous in favor of the provisions and Secretary Mills made a strong appeal on the radio to pass them. The so-called Progressives of each party also joined in the movement against the taxes under the leadership of Congressman La Guardia. It was expected, however, that a majority, even among the Democrats, would be found to vote for the bill in its entirety in order to redeem the Democratic pledge to balance the budget, since no substitute had yet been suggested to meet the deficit.—The Beck-Linthicum resolution to allow a vote in Congress on the question of the submission by Congress to the States of an

amendment returning to them the control of intoxicating liquors was defeated by a vote of 227 to 187. This was the smallest "dry" majority yet voted in the House. The parties split almost equally on the question and while urban constituencies were in the majority, many rural Representatives voted in favor of the resolution. The "wet" vote exceeded the expectations of both sides, though it was admitted that on an actual vote on the submission of the amendment, the majority against it might have been greater. Anti-Prohibitionists, however, freely predicted that their ranks would grow, while Prohibitionists universally held that their opponents had reached their "peak" strength. Immediately thereafter the so-called "wet" bloc made plans to force a vote on the Hull-O'Connor amendment of the Volstead Act to set the content of intoxicating beverages at 2.75 per cent, as can be done by a majority vote. In order to secure a vote in the House on the measure, 145 names must be secured for a petition. The great argument for this bill was the increased revenue for the Government.—The House Expenditures Committee refused to consider the proposed consolidation of the War and Navy Departments. The Democrats, however, passed a resolution by the House to extend the life of the Economy Committee, the purpose of which is to study ways and means to reduce drastically Government expenditures by concentrating many disparate Executive activities.

Governor Roosevelt, in an open primary in North Dakota, secured the twelve delegates of that State over Governor Murray of Oklahoma by a 2 to 1 majority.

The surprising thing about this vote was the number of those who voted as Democrats. Previously not more than 13,000 had ever voted in that party. Murray and Roosevelt together polled more than 60,000. This was interpreted as a sign of the decreasing popularity of President Hoover. Meanwhile, Governor Smith's attitude continued to be a disturbing factor to the leaders. In the face of some opposition, he persisted in keeping his name in the Massachusetts primaries. It was realized that if he lost there he would be eliminated, but that if he won he would again be in the race.

Bolivia.—A Cabinet crisis early in the month was finally adjusted when the Liberal party decided to co-operate with the Government, accepting the Ministries of Foreign Relations, Worship, Instruction, and Agriculture. The Cabinet changes were the result of a controversy between the Government and the Central Bank of Bolivia over proposals for inflation. Projects suggested by the

Minister of Finance met determined opposition from the Central Bank. Following the readjustment the Bank offered to cover the deficit in the budget calculated at 3,413,914.19 bolivianos. While the Ministry reorganization was going on the Senate convicted former President Hernando Siles, who was overthrown in June, 1930, and who had been a fugitive in Chile since that time, of two out of eleven charges filed against him in Congress—misuse of public funds and misconduct in having turned his office over to a military junta in May, 1930, instead of offering his resignation to Congress.

China.—After several meetings between representatives of the combatants, Japan finally began on March 16 to withdraw her troops from the Shanghai area, the

Peace
Parleys

Chinese meanwhile having promised not to advance into the neutral zone. For some days previous military operations had practically ceased. The Japanese move paved the way for formal peace talks, as suggested by the League of Nations Assembly in its resolution of March 11 when a Commission representing nineteen Powers was named to supervise the amicable settlement of the Sino-Japanese problems. A report issued by the Shanghai Bureau of Social Affairs on March 17 announced that consequent on the recent hostilities in Chapei, Kiangwan, and Woonung a total of 6,080 Chinese civilians were killed, more than 2,000 were wounded, and 10,040 were listed as missing. Meanwhile, Chinese Government troubles were augmented by Red uprisings in Kiangsi, and Kwangchow, in Honan province. On March 14 General Chiang Kai-Shek, former Chinese President, announced that he had decided to accept the Chairmanship of the Chinese Military Council with full responsibility for China's military affairs. Meanwhile, the new Government of Manchuria headed by Henry Pu Yi changed the name of the capital, Changchun, to Hsinching, and formally requested recognition from the United States and other countries. Temporarily the request was being ignored in Washington. Reports from Tokyo that Soviet Russia was about to recognize the new Government in Manchuria were denied. These failures to assume diplomatic relations were not unwise, for on March 18 press dispatches reported new revolts in Manchuria. It was stated that 100,000 Chinese volunteers were marching on Mukden from three directions while a local insurgent group had captured Fu-Yu in Kirin Province. A message to the Earl of Lytton, head of the League of Nations commission investigating the Sino-Japanese relations, from a group of Chinese organizations at Mukden declared that the 30,000,000 Chinese in Manchuria would rather share the destiny of China whatever it might be, than live under the rule of Japan.

On March 17 the Nineteen-Power Commission of the League of Nations held a meeting in Geneva dealing both with the Shanghai armistice situation and the new "independent" Manchurian State and Japan's relations to it. As for the armistice the Commission reaffirmed that there should be no price for the evacuation of Shanghai and laid down

the main lines which the peace proposals were to follow. It rejected the Tokyo proposal that it merely record what the Powers did in Shanghai and proclaimed itself as a court to which either disputant might appeal to have the letter and the spirit of the Assembly's resolutions respected. In a private session it called upon Japan and China to report what had been done towards its resolutions of September 30 and December 10, 1931, and Earl Lytton was instructed to rush his report on Manchurian affairs. Referring to the situation there, the Spanish delegate expressed the view that the creation of an independent Manchuria was contrary to Article X of the League covenant; hence, invalid; and suggested that action be taken regarding it.

France.—Aristide Briand was buried on March 12. In the Clock Room of the Foreign Ministry, where the body had lain for two days, Cardinal Verdier, Archbishop of Paris, pronounced a blessing, and the Premier, M. Tardieu, delivered a funeral oration before the representatives of fifty-five nations, assembled to do honor to the dead statesman. Military honors were rendered; then the body was interred in the cemetery at Passy, where it will rest until it is later transferred to Cocherel.—The Senate, by a vote of 175 to 131, postponed the scheduled debate on woman's suffrage until June. Observers predicted that the measure will fail of passage next summer, but the present postponement was a new blow to advocates of the bill, for it destroyed even the small hope that women might vote in the coming Parliamentary elections.—On March 17, the Chamber of Deputies, hitherto in favor of woman's suffrage, compulsory voting, and the abolishment of the second ballot in parliamentary elections, reversed its stand and accepted, by a vote of 299 to 227, the Senate's revision of the electoral bill. Socialists and Radical Socialists in the Chamber feared that a change to the single ballot would weaken their chances in the coming elections; the Chamber's rejection of the proposed change was regarded as an important victory for Left forces and also strengthened the position of the Senate in its battle with the Right majority of the Chamber. The voting on the measure was accompanied by tumultuous scenes.

Germany.—The German election has come and gone, only to return again on April 10. The results of votes cast on March 13 fell below the majority required, though President von Hindenburg came within 168,453 of the goal. In spite of the intense rivalry of the contending parties, the predictions of Adolf Hitler and his followers, the hardships and unemployment of the common people who had become restive under the humiliations and economic burdens which were the price of the War, the President of Germany and the idol of many in the nation, gathered in 18,661,736 out of a total of 37,660,377, which represented ninety per cent of the eligible votes. It was taken for granted in and out of Germany that Von Hindenburg would win easily in the run-off on April 10, when only

Election
Results

League
Commission
Moves

a plurality is required. Rumors had been afloat that the President would not consent to enter a second contest, having refused to play politics or barter with parties; but in the face of Hitler's strength, with the sad prospect of a divided Germany and possible civil war, he abandoned his dream of rest and world tour, and entered the contest "to save the best traditions of Germany and to preserve an honorable and dignified place among the nations of the world."

The result of the elections left Hitler in a sorry plight. Even though the National Socialist gained over their vote in 1925, they fell far short of their prediction of 18,000,-

Hitler
Power
Broken

000. The general impression was that they had reached their peak. Distrusted by the Nationalists and hated by the

Communists, it was considered improbable that his party could gather up more votes between now and the date of the second election. In many quarters it was interpreted as a blessing that the Government did not fall into Hitler's hands at this time. Foreign creditors were alarmed over the revolutionary spirit of Hitler's army, friends of the Republic dreaded the abandonment of democracy for fascism, and foreign Governments doubted the possibility of stable international relations, if Hitler had been successful. From the *New York Times* we learn that "Cheers for President von Hindenburg of Germany resounded through the streets of Paris . . . despite the fact that he had been the commander of the German armies in the last phases of the World War." Official Washington was also reported to have felt much relief in this decisive action of the German people to be true to themselves and faithful to their obligations.

The German Government protested against the plan sponsored by France to establish the so-called Danubian alliance. Since Premier Tardieu had not invited Germany

Germany
Protests

or Bulgaria to the conference, it meant that another obstacle to Germany's export trade would diminish her only

available income to pay her foreign debts. It was contended that such a condition was injurious to her creditors, and it was further shown that these smaller agricultural States needed the buying power of Germany. Hope was felt that the more favorable attitude of the Premier of France towards Germany's problem, and the agreement of England to cooperate on a final solution of the reparations question, would bring about a peaceful and satisfactory settlement at Lausanne.

Ireland.—Before the adjournment of the Dail, President De Valera proposed, in outline, the immediate program of his Government. He laid special stress on four

De Valera's
Four
Points

points, all of which were included in the policies put forward in his election campaign. The first of these was the

abolition of the oath of allegiance to King George. The oath, he stated, was not obligatory by the Treaty, but was a constitutional act; in the Constitution, adopted by the Free State Parliament, and therefore liable to change by the same authority, the oath was not mandatory; he contended that if an oath were taken, the form should

be that given; but an oath need not necessarily be taken. Mr. De Valera concluded that the oath was a purely domestic problem, and did not concern Great Britain. The second point was the suspension of the Public Safety act, passed by the Dail last October, and of the activities of the Military Courts. These were directed against illegal Republican organizations, alleged to be strongly Communistic. In regard to the third objective, the payment of about £3,000,000 in land annuities to the British treasury, President De Valera stated that such payments were not legally or morally obligatory. He contended that Great Britain must prove a right to these payments before a court of justice acceptable to both parties. As his fourth point, he proposed to effect a union, or merger, of the Irish Free State with the six counties of North-eastern Ireland. Ireland must be united, he declared, if for no other reason except that of economy; there was no need for two distinct Governments within the island, and no need for the customs barriers.

Upon his assumption of office, President De Valera forwarded to Pope Pius a message expressing hope in the continuance of cordial relations between the Holy See and Ireland. His Holiness, through Cardinal Pacelli, Secretary of State, replied that he was pleased with the President's message and thankful for "the expression of respectful homage," and that he bestowed the Apostolic blessing on the Irish people and its Government.—No decision was announced as to the likelihood of the new Government being represented at the Imperial Economic Conference that will be held in Ottawa next June. Mr. De Valera has retained to himself the post of Foreign Minister, and as such would be a representative at the Ottawa Conference and also at the League of Nations meetings.—An immediate economy move of the Fianna Fail Government was that of a voluntary reduction in Cabinet salaries. Mr. De Valera accepted a cut from £2,500 to £1,500, and the other Ministers followed his example.

As its first official act, the Government ordered the release of all political prisoners sentenced under the Public Safety act of Mr. Cosgrave's Government. Seventeen

Resurgence of
Republicanism

of these were freed from Arbour Hill prison and three others from Maryboro and Mountjoy prisons. Upon their re-

lease, they were feted and carried in street parades, and a demonstration attended by about 20,000 was held in their honor on College Green. Sean Magennis took occasion to appeal for recruits for the Saor Eire, an organization banned by the Cosgrave Government and the Hierarchy. He attacked the Bishops for their alleged interference in political affairs, and called on the Papal Nuncio for preventive action against them. The Irish Republican Army showed signs of much activity in recruiting, and *An Phoblact*, the extremist Republican paper, resumed publication, as did other suppressed periodicals. Mr. De Valera declared against the existence of two armies, but it was reported that he had not formulated any definite policy in regard to the extreme Republican movements.

Peru.—An unsuccessful attempt to assassinate President Luis M. Sanchez Cerro while in church on March 6 was followed by the court-martialing of Jose Arnaldo

Government
Downs
Apras

Melgar Marquez, Juan G. Seoane Corroles, and Reynaldo Bolanos Diaz.

Marquez, a youth of nineteen, who fired the shot at the President, and Corroles, his accomplice, were sentenced to death; Diaz to twenty years in prison. The defendants were all affiliated with the Apra party which had been defeated in the last elections and twenty-three leaders of which, along with Victor Haya de la Torre, their founder and the defeated candidate for President, had been deported by the Government in the beginning of the month for alleged complicity in a revolutionary plot. The Apra party was charged by the Government with being actively communistic.

Spain.—On March 11, President Alcalá Zamora signed a decree making effective Article 48 of the Constitution which prohibits religious instruction in the schools. On

Education and
Divorce
Laws

the same day the *Official Gazette* promulgated the divorce code which, for the first time in Spanish history, permits and recognizes civil divorce. The press reported that numerous cases were awaiting trial and that the courts would have a busy time during the next few weeks.

On March 16, the new Land Act was introduced, confiscating "feudal" properties without compensation and other estates with indemnity. These lands were to be sold to individuals or corporations capable of working them for farming purposes. The Act was expected to pass, though pleasing to none of the extremists.

Sweden.—Ivar Kreuger, president of the Swedish Match Company, and of the allied companies, reputed to be one of the world's greatest financial powers, shot

Suicide of
Kreuger

himself to death at his apartment in Paris on March 13. He was reported to have experienced extreme mental anxiety

over the weakening of his financial position by the German moratorium and the impossibility of recovering very large credits which his firm had advanced, together with the persistent selling of his stocks.

League of Nations.—Speaking in the British House of Lords on March 16, Viscount Snowden of Ickornshaw disclosed that the League of Nations, and the British,

Liberia

French, and United States Governments had failed to put an end to slavery in Liberia. The recommendations of the

League's financial commission, made after the visit of the Christie Commission to the Republic of Liberia in 1930, had brought a very unsatisfactory reply from the Liberian Government.

Likelihood that the project of André Tardieu, French Foreign Minister, for an economic federation of the Danubian nations, appeared lessened when on March 16

Danubian
Federation

the German Government issued a statement opposing the plan. The Germans contended that such a Federation would not assist the nations concerned in disposing of their

agrarian surplus. They suggested, however, that Austria's problem would be solved by preferential tariff treatment; from all her neighbors; and Hungary's by arrangement with some nation that had excess agricultural consumption. Germany could not stand further curtailment of her export market.

Disarmament.—A draft resolution on "moral disarmament," making "incitement to war" a prison offense was proposed by Marjan Szumlakowski, Polish delegate,

Moral
Disarmament

in the Arms Conference on March 15. A committee of twenty-one members was

appointed to study the question of moral disarmament. Educational and publicity aspects would also be considered. On March 14 Senator Swanson, American delegate, defeated by his eloquence a move on the part of Admiral Pound, of Great Britain, to allow nations, in contravention of the Washington and London naval agreements, to make use, in the event of war, of battleships that were under course of construction for another country.

International Economics.—On March 11 the International Chamber of Commerce issued from Paris another of its habitual warnings that unless armaments and tariffs

Warning against
Arms and
Tariffs

were reduced and reparations and War debts settled, the world could not hope to emerge from the present economic

crisis. Silas H. Strawn, chairman of the American committee, warned against the harmful effects of the import quota system; and the perils of fruit embargoes were denounced. It was reported that the British and the French Governments were preparing to make a special study of the situation that would result at the expiration of the Hoover debt moratorium in June of this year. Also that United States commercial and patriotic organizations were about to issue a demand for a total embargo on all Soviet products.

The words "Bread, Bacon, and Beans," are better known in the West than in the East. William Allen Page will make them the title for his article next week on William ("Alfalfa Bill") Murray, the surprising Governor of Oklahoma.

"Eugenics in the Telephone Directory" will really be an article about the Irish in Boston. It will be in the usual genial style of its author, Dr. James J. Walsh, and he will put together some findings of a Boston editor that have a subtle lesson.

Jerome Blake, stirred by recent cavortings in the press, has been moved to wonder why we don't "do something about it." The result will be "Crusading against Credulity" and it will be practical as well as indignant.

"Hospital Case" will be the authentic self-story of one man who wandered away—not very far away—and who found his road back in a hospital. The writer is Thomas F. Healy.

The article, "The Departure of the Jesuits," was unavoidably held over.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 26, 1932

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
GERARD B. DONNELLY
Associate Editors

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Medallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

A Great Educator

THE death of the Most Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D., J.U.L., marked the passing of an outstanding figure in American Catholic education. More than forty years ago, the young Dr. Shahan went to the Catholic University, as professor of church history and patrology, and in that capacity he acted for eighteen years. In 1909, he was appointed Rector of the University by the Holy See, and he held this position of honor and toil until his resignation in 1928.

When Dr. Shahan went to Washington in 1891, he found at the new University a small band of scholars whose financial resources were as shallow as their wisdom was deep. Under the guidance of the Holy See, these men went forward undaunted, and succeeded in laying the substantial foundations upon which their successors have erected the University which for years the Hierarchy in this country had desired. On resigning his post nearly forty years later, Bishop Shahan left an institution commensurate in dignity and educational achievement with the high hopes of the Founders. Year by year, under his inspiration, the University had grown in influence. Its graduates were finding high place in Church and State. Its researches and its contributions to knowledge were acknowledged and welcomed by scholars and learned societies in every part of the world.

In one phase only of its existence has disappointment been encountered. The financial aid which was rightly expected has never been sufficient. Scholars know the University's worth, but, judging by its contributions, the Catholic public does not. To say that the University's income from endowment and gifts is respectable, would be an exaggeration. The characteristic generosity of its professors, whose stipends are certainly not in keeping with the worth of their services, has alone enabled the University to maintain its existence and high standing in the academic world.

The duty of Catholics to support the University is clear. It was stressed by Pius XI in the Apostolic Letter issued a few years ago. Acting by commission from the Holy

Father, the Bishops in the United States have been considering ways and means of increasing the endowments and revenues of the University, so that through an assured income, the financial standing of the University can be placed on a secure basis. It is hoped that with the blessing of Almighty God, their plans will bring home to all Catholics the value of the work of the University and their duty to support it generously.

Although the University was the center of Dr. Shahan's interest, he found time to take a leading part in every educational enterprise of his day. For many years, he was president of the National Catholic Educational Association, and he was associated from the outset with that group of scholars whose labors gave us that authoritative and indispensable work, the "Catholic Encyclopedia." Bishop Shahan was a gentleman, a scholar, an administrator of rare ability, and a true priest of God. May he rest in peace.

Amendments and Counter-Amendments

THESE are the days of amendments to the Constitution, and of counter-amendments. For some sixty years from the opening of the nineteenth century, we went along blissfully with only two Amendments—for the famous First Ten are really part of the original instrument. But the close of the War between the States whetted our appetite for new constitutional adventures, and since that time we have added seven more.

Senator Norris has at last succeeded in obtaining favorable action on his "lame-duck" Amendment. There is no serious opposition to this measure which embodies no new principle, but simply changes the time for newly elected candidates to assume their offices. Virginia acted so quickly that the sticklers for constitutional niceties have questioned the validity of its approval. New York followed a few days later, and there is little doubt that within a brief period the Amendment will be incorporated into the Constitution.

The same report cannot be made of the Beck-Linthicum resolution, rejected by the House on March 14 by a vote of 227 to 187. This resolution, framing in effect an Amendment to permit the States to resume control of the liquor traffic, was in substance a repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. It may be said, however, that Messrs. Beck and Linthicum are not bowed down with disappointment, since not even in their most sanguine moments had they hoped for victory.

Yet a victory has been gained. For the first time in many years, Congressmen have been compelled to stand up in public, and record their votes on Prohibition in the clear light of day. Ninety-seven Republicans and ninety Democrats took the stand that since this great moral experiment had failed, it would be wise to remand the case to the people. But 112 Republicans and 114 Democrats, many of whom represented districts in which the bootleg trade flourishes like the bay tree, declined to allow the case to be taken to the people. In their judgment, while the great moral experiment is not precisely a success, taking a vote would be a calamity.

As far as the present Congress is concerned, the Beck-

Linthicum resolution has been consigned to the dust heap. But its authors have not labored in vain. Hereafter the people can always know exactly how their representatives in Congress have voted, and this knowledge will not rest on rumor but on evidence. Nothing has been lost by this battle and much has been gained.

The God of Nations

WRITING his report of the International Disarmament Conference, in session at Geneva, our special correspondent, the Rev. Joseph F. Thorning, S.J., reported that few of the representatives of the Powers referred either to God or to the precepts of Christianity. Among the few were Chancellor Bruening, of Germany, Count Apponyi, and Jonkheer Beelaerts van Blokland, a representative from The Netherlands.

Emboldened by this example, possibly, a number of petitions were later laid before the Conference, among them a set of resolutions, asking an appreciable reduction in armaments, indorsed by Catholic societies for women, numbering more than 20,000,000. In presenting the petition, Mme. F. Steenberghe-Engeringh, president of the International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues, ended her brief address with the words, "Convinced that 'unless God build the city, they labor in vain that build it,' we trust that God may be ever with you."

The peroration recalls another famous speech, delivered at Philadelphia in 1787. During one of the darkest periods of the Constitutional Convention, the venerable Franklin rose to make the address which Madison has thus recorded in his famous Journal:

In this situation of this Assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the Contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for the Divine protection. . . . Our prayers, Sir, were heard and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? or do we imagine that we no longer need his assistance? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that *God Governs in the affairs of men*. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writings that "except the Lord Build the House they labour in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building, no better than the Builders of Babel: We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and bye word down to future ages.

It would be well for the world were this wise advice followed by the League of Nations in its assemblies, and by the many associations and leagues allied with it. All men look hopefully to its deliberations, trusting that in the end the old diplomacy, the mechanism of a cold and inhuman philosophy, will be completely repudiated. But there are times when their confidence seems misplaced.

Following the lead of Pius XI, Catholics will everywhere cooperate, in keeping with the rules laid down for their guidance, with all movements for domestic and international peace. They are not only disposed to support the League in its endeavors to establish the peace of the world on a firm and lasting basis, but are most desirous to work with it to this end, as far as may be possible.

That the efforts at Geneva have met with even a fair measure of success, can hardly be asserted. Were the meetings controlled by the spirit which Franklin strove to bring to the deliberations at Philadelphia, we might today be appreciably nearer world peace. But men of good will throughout the world may take new heart when they learn that Almighty God has not been completely excluded from the counsels of the Disarmament Conference.

Federal Misappropriations

WRITING in the *Chicago Tribune*, R. H. Little comments on the ability of any bureau at Washington to think up more ways of spending money in one minute than the average family of five could plot out in a whole year. Congress has the same gift.

We have called attention more than once to the free-handed misappropriations of public funds, which have become customary in some bureaus. Lumber companies, for instance, can save money by employing the Government to make extensive surveys, and to conduct elaborate and costly experiments in physical and chemical laboratories. It is true that the company must pay a fee, but this fee equals only a small percentage of the cost. The deficit is made up by the Government. Put in other words, the Government collects money from the people, and uses it to defray the operating costs of a private corporation. That these misappropriations are authorized by Congress, at least indirectly, only makes the case worse.

Last year, the tobacco growers began to learn a lesson. Certain groups among them, engaged in the exportation of tobacco products, concluded that they needed a foreign representative, to keep them informed on commercial and political conditions abroad. Instead of appointing and paying their own man, they took a leaf from the book of the bureaucrats, and went to Washington. Here they labored quietly, but fruitfully, for they knew their Washington. A few days ago, the Senate committee on appropriations authorized the appointment of the representative desired, and fixed his salary at \$15,000.

It does not seem to have occurred to any member of the committee that the Federal Government has no right to pay the salary of an employe of a private corporation from the public funds. The incident has gone almost unnoted, but it is to be hoped that on further reflection the committee will rescind the authorization. On the same principle, any business which decided to engage in the foreign trade, could secure from the Government, free of all cost, a high-priced expert.

Once bureaucracy begins, it is difficult to set any limit upon its depredations. Every fresh inroad upon the money of the people finds its justification in the fact that other inroads have gone before it to create a precedent. Pre-

cedent appears to be strong enough to prevail even during the greatest depression the country and the world have ever experienced. "Retrenchment" is a word that is in favor at Washington. But retrenchment is not.

The German Elections

ON hearing the news of the elections in Germany, the world breathed more easily. President von Hindenburg failed of reelection by the narrowest of margins, but his vote of nearly forty-nine and one-half per cent, in an election which brought out ninety per cent of the voters, indicates that he will be chosen in the election of April 10.

The foreigner who undertakes to assess the party policies of another people enters on a difficult task. Usually he does not see the little details in the background which often give a clue to the inner meaning of the great events that move noisily across the national stage. Yet, viewed from the American angle, the elections seem to mean that the old thrifty, law-abiding, home-loving, intellectual Germany, which we knew before the passions of the World War obscured our vision, means to retain control of the Government. That it also means the downfall of Hitler and his inflammatory program, is not so certain.

There was much in that program to appeal to the passions of a Germany still nursing its wounds. Germany may be the most prosperous country in Europe, or, according to the school of propagandists which gains your ear, a country on the abyss of national bankruptcy. In sober fact, however, like the rest of the world, Germany has its centers of poverty and destitution. Millions are looking in vain for work. In many of the industrial towns, factories are falling into decay.

Thus, the scene was set for a revolution when Hitler came upon the stage. Where the Government counseled delay, Hitler was for action, and that is a program which always captures the unthinking, who never stop to reflect that action at the wrong time may end in destruction, and frequently does. Rightly or wrongly, the mass of the German people attribute their economic distress to the policies which were brought in by the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler played upon that persuasion. That he failed, is convincing evidence of the sanity of the German people, and a tribute to the wisdom of Chancellor Bruening and his associates.

But with all this granted, the program which can win more than 11,000,000 votes in a total of less than 38,000,000, cannot be said to lack friends. The Government is not yet out of the woods. Hitler has again raised his banner. Probably, he labors under no delusions, but he is clever enough to know that even if he fails to win the prize, he need not fail to win concessions. If he cannot be a ruler, he can pose as an obstructionist, and like the old Irish party in the British Parliament, get half a loaf by his threat to cut off the majority from all access to the cupboard. Hitler may pass, but the old spirit of discontent will remain, unless both the German Government and the other Powers join hands to restore peace.

Capitalists in France and in the United States welcome Von Hindenburg, because they feel that under his Govern-

ment there will be no repudiation of private bonds and other securities. With the removal of these apprehensions, the recent agreement of the British and French Governments to work hand in hand for the restoration of a pacified Europe gains strength. While it is impossible to disregard the economic factors which influence, when they do not completely control, international relations, it is to be hoped that the European Powers and the United States may now be able to deal with the German Government on a basis from which charity and justice are not wholly excluded.

The German people have shown definitely that they have no welcome for a policy of war and revolution. Let all Governments now unite to aid the Government which they have chosen in forwarding the interests of humanity and international peace by the creation of a peace-loving, prosperous Germany.

On Alien Strands

BANISHMENT to a foreign country is not a punishment which the Federal Government may impose upon a citizen. Whatever his crime, unless it be a capital crime, he may insist upon his right to live his life in this country, although in its turn the Government may insist that he spend it in a penitentiary.

But since the decision of the Supreme Court last month in the Blackmer case, the Government has a new power. At least, it is a power that was unsuspected until Senator Walsh, of Montana, felt himself foiled in his investigation of the Government oil leases. It seems that the United States may reach to an alien strand, search out a citizen, and after serving him with the proper papers, order him to return to the United States. Should he decline, the Government may try him for contempt, and collect the fine, should he be found guilty, by levying on his property.

This power may seem to be almost a bizarre exercise of authority, and not a few learned members of the bench and bar feared that the Supreme Court would decline to affirm it. The statute introduced by Senator Walsh provides for the issuance of a subpoena to a citizen of the United States abroad, when his presence at a criminal trial is necessary. Service is to be made by the United States consul, and on proof of service and of failure to appear, the citizen may be found guilty of contempt. A fine of not more than \$100,000 may be imposed, and the citizen's property may be seized to satisfy it. In the case reviewed by the Supreme Court, the defendant had been held guilty on two counts, and had been fined \$30,000 and costs on each.

The defense fell back on the "due-process" clause, and argued that a consul could be empowered to serve a subpoena only as permitted by treaty. The Chief Justice swept this defense aside in an opinion which contained some salutary admonitions on the duty of all citizens, even if they must travel abroad, to lay aside all other business and aid the processes of justice. While the legal issues in this case may be subtle, the opinion of the Supreme Court is plain and blunt.

The Fourth Word from the Cross

WILLIAM H. McCLELLAN, S.J.

About the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying: *Eli, Eli, lamma sabacthani?* That is: My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? (Matt. xxvii, 46).

THIS utterance of our Divine Redeemer has often proved perplexing. It is matter of unquestionable faith that He could not for a moment be either morally or physically disunited from God the Father—not only in that Godhead which was forever identical with the Father's own, but neither in that perfect Humanity which the same Godhead had created and taken to Himself in a union whose indissoluble bond was Divine Personality. If, then, the suffering Christ could never be really forsaken by God, how could He ever have believed Himself forsaken?

Just possibly, the Fourth Word from the Cross does not furnish clear evidence that He did so believe. Doubtless He did experience, at this stage of His Passion, a keen sense of interior loneliness and helplessness. But His words, which appear to avow so much more than this, will presently be seen to have an independent reason and propriety of their own on quite another account.

The psychic experience itself was emotional in character. Our Lord evidently felt as if deserted by the favor and support of His Father. Feeling, however, is not judgment. Even under the strongest emotional stress, we are able to recognize the emotion in its true nature and source, and not to confuse it with the judgment of intellect. This is often evident in the interior conflict against some temptation to evil. Under strong and insistent impulse of the affections toward some forbidden object, the practical judgment, functioning as moral conscience, is still able to distinguish inclination from deliberate purpose.

The same fact is equally clear in certain experiences which involve no direct temptation to evil. Consider those interior states which are known as spiritual desolation. Here the affections are not merely apathetic, but positively recoil from conscious approach to God in prayer, create aversion to His service, and even impel to despondency. Yet in the very midst of an interior sense of overwhelming bitterness, the mind can retain an undisturbed confidence, founded upon faith and the witness of a clear conscience, that the Divine support has not been actually withdrawn, and that the anguish of the averted affections will not endure too long.

Inasmuch as the saints themselves have known this agony of soul to its bitterest depths, it was germane to the Passion that the human soul of Christ should sound the same abyss of guiltless desertion. Else would He not have shared with us in all that is not sin. The real mystery at stake in this truth is not why He should have suffered thus, but rather how He could. For His perfect soul, though of like nature in all things with our own imperfect ones, was intimately united to Godhead in the Person of the Eternal Word. Present to it, therefore, at every

moment of His existence, was the very source of heaven's all-possessing bliss, the "Beatific Vision"—the apprehension of God which beatifies, or renders supremely happy.

That His soul could ever know a sorrow or a care could only be due to His voluntary abdication of the overwhelming joy which, inevitably flowing from that source, must make all pain ineffectual. Abdication there was, and voluntary; it began on Thursday night, at the gate of Gethsemane's wall; it was necessary to that period of propitiatory suffering which He avowed in saying to His captors, "This is your hour, and the power of darkness." Through those fifteen hours of dread mystery He made it possible for Himself to suffer every human misery, restraining—we know now how—the connatural effect upon His soul of its intimate and conscious union with Deity. And, indeed, if He would leave His body exposed to pain, why not His soul as well? For the senses of the soul can suffer what the mind knows to be undeserved; and servant may not be greater than Lord in the ministry of guiltless pain. "When He hath let out His own sheep, He goeth before them."

Both the character and the motive of Christ's interior sense of desertion are therefore in full accord with the purpose of His redeeming Passion. But the difficulty of His recorded words has not yet been met. They seem not merely to express emotion, but to avow a conviction of fact. He did not ask, "Why can I not feel Thy presence and support?" but, "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" Of themselves the words express a mental judgment; even in interrogation form, they affirm a fact; and the Speaker could not be deceived. How, then, can we say that He did not clearly believe that union had given place to real separation?

First (and this would be enough), because, in the very wording of His prayer, God is still to Him "my God." But, secondly, because these words were not original with Him, and because He quoted them with their original meaning pointedly in view.

Many of us will have noticed what most commentators remark, that the Fourth Word from the Cross is the opening verse of Psalm xxi. Moreover, the quotation was more exact than it may seem to us. In our English version of this Psalm, the repeated address "My God" is followed immediately by the words "Look upon me." Here the Vulgate's *respice in me* has its counterpart in the elder Greek of the Septuagint. But these words cannot be traced further back; they are neither in the Hebrew nor in its Aramaic versions (the "Targums"). Thus, the briefer version of Psalm xxi, 1, as ascribed by the Evangelists to our Lord, is in accord with our extant Hebrew text. In St. Matthew the verb alone, instead of being Hebrew, is Aramaic, as was Christ's usual speech and that of the masses about Him. But even in St. Matthew, *Eli, Eli*, is Hebrew; and, as Dalman observes,

the fact that some of the bystanders (not so familiar with the Biblical tongue as with Aramaic) thought that Elias (*Elijah*) was invoked, shows that St. Matthew has reported the actual word, and makes it possible, if not probable, that the whole utterance was in the Hebrew of the Old Testament.

This would be instantly recognized by the priests and scribes who stood by, and who had been the real leaders of all opposition to our Lord's claim and ministry. He had chosen from their Scriptures a telling message for themselves. Its remoter force lay in the fact that this very Psalm was regarded by the Jews themselves as containing several Messianic predictions. Schöttgen collects from Rabbinical sources Messianic interpretations of seven different passages. Fino Fini had in the fifteenth century done the like for the first verse itself, though the passage he cited has since mysteriously disappeared from its source.

But more pertinent than this prophetic character of the Psalm in Jewish belief is the rôle played by one of its verses in the drama of the Passion, before the utterance of the Fourth Word. St. Matthew (xxvii, 41-43) tells us that "the chief priests, with the scribes and ancients, mocking, said" amongst other things: "he trusted in God: let him now deliver him, if he will have him!" Not only is this an almost verbatim citation of Psalm xxi, 9, but, furthermore, this ninth verse, put to so strange and striking a use by Christ's oppressors, is one of those to which Messianic meaning has been attributed by Jewish writers themselves.

And to what a use it was put on Calvary! Its words were not those of the afflicted Prophet, but cited by him as the gibe of his persecutors. Can the priests at Calvary have remembered this, pushing their mockery of our

Saviour's claim even to this refinement of subtlety? It hardly seems likely, since, even in accommodating the words to what they would consider a reversed situation, they would still be consciously borrowing the words of evildoers aimed against the just. More probably the words came naturally to hand as being so familiar. They flung at Christ a taunt recorded as unjust, without for the moment recalling its inspired source. Mad with the very frenzy of their malicious triumph, any appropriate words would serve them, even a blasphemous calumny heaped upon a blameless sufferer and a Prophet.

The force of these words in their original connection could not escape our Lord. Here was a challenge, even if unconscious, to proclaim Himself once more with His dying breath. An hour later He accepted that challenge. Then, when the darkness was deepest all about the Cross, the pain of loneliness was keenest in the soul of the Victim. It must not pass unspoken, this anguish of His soul; we must be given to know that, even here, He goeth before us. And yet in uttering His woe, He will have words that serve at the same time a greater purpose still—the purpose of one last confession of His Messiahship in the teeth of its defamers.

Back at His boastful mockers, out of the silence and the dark, come the words they know so well: *Eli, Eli lamma sabacthani?* Back come those words in all the power of their unmistakable source, an acceptance of the challenge, and a dying repetition of His identity. The priests may have forgot the source of their own taunt, but they now recall it in a flash. They have spoken the language of unjust oppression; they are answered with the prayer of the oppressed. Who was he, that Psalmist, but a prophet of the Messianic days? And who is this present Sufferer, who makes that prayer His own?

New Light on Mother Seton

ARTHUR J. BURNS

IT is regrettable to find that much material concerning the life of Mother Elizabeth Ann Bayley Seton, as given to us by several biographers and genealogists, was, apparently, gathered together without considering all the records on file during her lifetime. Everything following is written simply to correct errors that have been made by over-enthusiastic historians and writers.

Dr. Charles I. White states in his book "Eliza A. Seton," that Eliza Ann Bayley was the younger of two daughters, the only children of Dr. Richard Bayley by his first marriage with Catherine Charlton, while Father Code, in his translation of Mme. de Barbery's "Elizabeth Seton," records her as the elder of the two. Archbishop Seton agrees with Dr. White. The Rev. John C. Reville, S.J., in his recent pamphlet says, "she was the second of three daughters." The Jesuit priest is correct. If any one knew the true facts, it should have been Mother Seton's maternal grandfather, the Rev. Richard Charlton, rector of St. Andrew's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Staten Island, N. Y., who lived several months

after the death of his daughter Catherine Bayley. His last will and testament, proved in the Surrogate's Court, New York, on October 10, 1777, and recorded there in liber 31, page 61, bequeathed a Negro girl, who was known by the name of Bett, to his granddaughter Mary Bayley, and to her two sisters, a Negro boy who was known by the name of Brenners. This "just" grandfather, after disposing of a few bequests, left one-third of his estate to his son John (of whom little or nothing is mentioned by our chroniclers), one-third to his grandson John Dongan, and one-third to the children of his daughter Catherine Bayley.

When we find how her father treated this saintly child, the story of Florence in Dickens' "Dombey and Son" is recalled to mind. Dr. Richard Bayley married twice, the second wife being Charlotte Amelia Barclay, a descendant of the Roosevelt family. Eliza was very fond of both her father and stepmother, and writes that she found the new Mrs. Bayley a "woman of rare and sweet attainments." Strange, therefore, it is to relate that her father

disinherited both Eliza and her older sister Mary, which he did when Mother Seton was only fourteen years of age. On December 3, 1788, in the shadow of Christmas and the love of children, Dr. Bayley drew his last will and testament which stood unchanged, thirteen years later, at the time of his death, in which he absolutely ignored the very existence of his children by his first wife. He left a farm, in trust, for his mother Susannah, who had married a John Garrineau as a second husband, and left the rest, residue, and remainder to his second wife in trust for her heirs and assigns. Even the farm above mentioned was to be considered the "rest, residue and remainder" of his estate, after the death of his mother.

This will and testament was proved in the Surrogate's Court in New York, on August 26, 1801, two days before Mother Seton's twenty-seventh birthday. Charlotte Bayley, the second wife, made her last will and testament on February 25, 1805, in which she left the entire estate equally between her seven children, whom she took the trouble to name—omitting the names of Mary Bayley Post, and Elizabeth Bayley Seton—share and share alike, except that the silver plate and table linen were given her two daughters Helen and Mary Fitch. This will was proved in the same court on November 21, 1805.

Dr. Bayley not only disinherited his first children, Mary Magdalen and Elizabeth Ann, but named the second daughter by his second wife Mary, thus having two daughters by the same name, both living at the same time.

As stated before, John Charlton, an uncle of Mother Seton's, is never mentioned, yet he was a just man. He, too, made a will (and codicils) in which he stated that his niece Mary Bayley Post, and his niece Elizabeth, widow of William Magee Seton, were each to receive the sum of \$2,500.

The Bayley wills were drawn before Mother Seton became a Catholic, so that was no reason for the cruel omission of names. But, Dr. John Charlton's will was proved on July 3, 1806, after Elizabeth's conversion to the Church of Rome. There was no contest. Mother Seton obeyed the will of her father.

Many seem to have the idea Mother Seton was one of two children, and several wonder how Archbishop Bayley was her nephew. Dr. Bayley was the father of ten children, the ninth being Guy, who married Grace Roosevelt. Of this marriage was born James Roosevelt Bayley, later known as Archbishop Bayley of Baltimore.

There seem to be some conflicting ideas as to what date Mother Seton entered the Catholic Church. Notwithstanding all investigations, Mother Seton definitely sets the day as March 15, 1805. She states this very clearly in a letter to Bishop Cheverus, as follows:

My soul has offered all its hesitations and reluctancies as sacrifice, with the blessed sacrifice on the altar, on the fourteenth of March, and the *next day* was admitted to the true Church of Jesus Christ, with a mind grateful and satisfied as that of a poor ship-wrecked mariner on being restored to his true home.

Some confusion is centered around her visit to St. Peter's Church on Barclay Street, New York, on Ash Wednesday (February 27) of which she wrote:

If I could have thought of anything but God, there was enough, I suppose, to have astonished a stranger by the hurrying over of the congregation; but as I came only to visit his Majesty, I knew *not* what it meant till afterwards, that it was a day they received ashes, the beginning of Lent; and the droll, but most venerable Irish Priest, who seems just come here, talked of death so familiarly that *he* delighted and received me.

She does not say she made any profession of faith that day, but clearly states she had come only to adore his Majesty. The good priest received her after the ceremonies, but *not* into the church. Possibly that day began her intensive instructions which ended gloriously on March 15. Dr. White adds, "After the service, Mrs. Seton made a formal abjuration of Protestantism and a Profession of the Catholic Faith at the hands of Father Matthew O'Brien and in presence of Mr. Antonio Felicchi, her devoted friend," but the very wording shows these are not Mother Seton's words. It is more convincing to believe, at that time, she *declared her intention* to enter the church, in presence of Father Matthew O'Brien and Antonio Felicchi.

Some venture to say, following a note at the foot of page 156 of Dr. White's "Life of Eliza A. Seton," "By admission to the true church, Mrs. Seton *probably* means that she was baptized conditionally and approached the Sacrament of Penance." Mother Seton was baptized in the Episcopal Church, which Baptism being usually valid in the eyes of the Roman Church, she was probably not baptized again. She, herself says, she made an "Abjuration of Protestantism and a Profession of the Catholic Faith," which was all she could do. It is true that, in honor of the joyful occasion Mother Seton, gave to Mr. Felicchi, who had been instrumental in her conversion, a copy of the "Following of Christ," with this inscription: "Antonio Felicchi, from his dear sister and friend, Eliza A. Seton, to commemorate the happy day he presented her to the Church of God, the fourteenth of March 1805," which was apparently given on the eve of her entry. She may have meant she had been informed on the fourteenth of March that the next day she would be formally brought into the True Fold, but her own words on "Admission to the Faith" center on March 15.

Although such a conversion is generally entered on the Church records, it was not compulsory that such be done, and to our sorrow, Father Matthew O'Brien left no entry in the Books of Record of St. Peter's Church that will clear the matter.

For several years, and again this year, a very careful search has been made to locate the Episcopal Church record of her Baptism. The claim is that that event took place in Trinity Church, Broadway and Wall Streets, New York City. The authorities, and historians, tell us that on September 21, 1776 (two years and twenty-four days after Mother Seton's birth), Trinity Church was completely destroyed by fire and the records burned and lost forever. The fire broke out about Whitehall, destroyed parts of Broad, Stone, and Beaver Streets, Broadway, and the streets going to the North River, and all along that river as far as King's College. Beside Trinity Church, the old Lutheran Church and 493 houses were burned (St. Paul's at the then upper end of Broadway

escaped very narrowly). So there is no record now to be found in the New York Episcopal churches proving the Baptism, although every reason exists to believe there *was* such a record in Trinity, now destroyed. To leave no avenue of search open, it was made certain that her grandfather, the Rev. Richard Charlton, did not perform the Sacrament. Diligent search was made of records of St. Andrew's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Staten Island, of which he was rector, with no result. We knew Elizabeth Bayley's mother died in Newtown, Long Island; thinking it possible that the child might have been baptized in what is now Queens County, a search was made in Grace Episcopal Church, Jamaica, L. I. (established in

1702), but again, nothing was to be found. Mother Seton was a well-educated woman, Father O'Brien knew his duties and obligations; therefore we have no fear of asserting the ceremony took place in Old Trinity, but the fire in 1776 wiped out the written record.

There is sufficient proof that, outside of Baptism by water, her desire was proclaimed "around the world." No sweeter character ever lived in this beautiful land of ours. Although historians may disagree on genealogy, and dates of events, never has one word but of highest praise been written or sung of this great woman whom we hope, God willing, will be raised to our altars as the first saint born in the United States.

The Blessing of Briand

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

THAT fifty-five nations were represented at the funeral in Paris on March 12 of Aristide Briand was noteworthy enough. But still more noteworthy, in the minds of those who had pursued him with their hate or lavished upon him their praise, was the fact that the Church bestowed her blessing upon the remains of a man who won his first fame as an active persecutor of the Church. More historical perspective than this generation possesses may be needed to solve this paradox; yet some answer to the question may present itself.

When, on March 4, 1905, M. Briand, then Minister of Public Worship, presented his 145-page report on the bill for the separation of Church and State in the French Republic, there was nothing remotely to indicate that he would ever be anything his life long than a relentless opponent of the Church, the Papacy, and of religion itself. The committee of thirty-three that had assisted in the preparation of the report was presided over by Ferdinand Buisson, who, with Ferry, Combes, and Steeg had been chiefly instrumental in secularizing French education. The "separation of Church and State" which these men engineered, and which passed into law on December 9, of the same year, was not the peaceable agreement to work independently of one another that we understand by the separation of Church and State in the United States. It was what Cardinal Mercier characterized as "the official apostasy of States"; it was a deliberate construction of government on the theory that the Church is the enemy of the civil power.

Whatever force there was in the violence of the anti-religious sectaries, it was the adroitness, the inventiveness of M. Briand which saved the day for the Separation. For the Government, utterly taken back by Pius X's condemnation of the "cultural associations," which were offered in lieu of the confiscated Churches, was confronted by the fact that the people would continue to worship in them anyhow; yet how was this worship to be legalized? Said Clemenceau in the Chamber of Deputies: "We are faced with difficulties that no Government has had to meet since 1870!" M. Briand was ready to resign at Clemenceau's reproaches; but Jaurès effected a reconciliation.

From then on we see his infinite resourcefulness working one device after another. He rendered illusory, by his further amendments, the law of April, 1908, which would at least have provided for the aged and infirm members of the clergy. Briand's eloquence was employed in blaming Pius X as the real cause of the Separation, owing to his refusal to accept a system which, like the Mexican Constitution of 1917, would disrupt the very constitution of the Church. In June, 1909, his logical mind refused to recognize any rights on the part of the parish clergy even in the internal administration of their own church buildings: "The ministers of Catholic worship, even when they have been invested by their bishops with the title of 'pastor' (*curé*) or 'assistants,' are only simple occupants of the churches without any juridic title." Which learned opinion the Court of Cassation promptly turned down: "the ministers of Catholic worship possess all the rights which are necessary for them in order to assure the free exercise of that worship in the places where it is practiced; . . . they alone exercise the rights in question," etc.

Yet some fifteen years later that same M. Briand was pleading, winning his point against a whirlwind of anti-clerical opposition, for the resumption of official relations with the Holy See by the French Republic; relations made possible, in turn, by Pius XI's recognition of diocesan councils which, though superficially resembling the famous cultural associations, were totally different in spirit and in administration. Did that rebuff of 1909 lay seed of understanding in his mind that the Church, whether you love or hate her, simply *is* an entity? Did he begin to realize then that the Catholic Church is a moral personage, that can never be dealt with, even by the finest fiction of the law, as a mere collection of individuals? And did that lead him, during the tremendous War years of the "Sacred Union," to appreciate the Church not merely as a moral entity, but as a moral force, who gave millions of her children courage to lay down their lives to save that *Patrie* that he had so subtly shorn of its spiritual crown of glory? I assume that if this hypothesis, is not correct, the true one is so very different.

On New Year's Day, 1927, M. Briand, after having been Prime Minister ten times over a space of seventeen years, having held seventeen portfolios, including ten times that of Foreign Minister, received the solemn congratulations of the Papal Nuncio, Archbishop Maglione, for his discourse to the Assembly of the League of Nations on September 10, 1926, when the Germany delegation took its place in that body. "No one," said the Nuncio, "could recall that discourse without emotion." M. Briand, indeed, had declared fervently for peace. Mothers, he exclaimed, could now clasp their little ones to their breasts without feelings of anguish. War was ended: "Away with rifles, machine guns, and cannons! Room for conciliation, arbitration, peace!" It was the New Briand, the Briand of the Washington Arms Conference in 1921; of Cannes, in 1922; of Locarno, in 1925; of the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1927; of the London Naval Conference; of the European Federation in 1930; in short, the Briand of the League of Nations and the World Court, the international instead of the sectarian Briand, who was so signally honored on that day with the praise of the Church through her representative.

What was it in Briand that gained the approval of the Church, in one who never attained to the profession of the Catholic Faith; never formally abjured his previous denunciations of Christianity?

Surely it was not the gross accusation of traitorous internationalism, unjust to Briand, who remained a patriot to the end; calumniating to the Holy See, as if the Holy Father were in collusion with the enemies of France. Every change was rung on this theme by the ultra-Nationalists. "The miserable Briand, the man of the Separation," was seen to supplicate for diplomatic relations with the Vatican. "Briandism," according to the weird logic of Charles Maurras, leader of the Action Française, was playing up German democracy in order to emasculate Germany, and so the whole of Europe, just as Bismarck encouraged the French Republic so as to ruin France. The Count du Plessis politely referred to Briand as a "public malefactor." "As Hugenberg treated Dr. Stresemann in Germany," said Briand, "there are French Hugenburgs who would treat me in the same fashion." Yet even his friend Dr. Stresemann learned that Briand's accommodating spirit had a limit.

Was it a mere emotional, idealistic love of peace that earned the commendation of the Church? Briand himself disclaimed that he was actuated by any such merely emotional pacificism. He appealed to reason, to "the moral guarantees of security," not to sentiment. "Frankly," he asked, when interpellated by the French Parliament in November, 1929, "is that spirit reasonable in France, which would have wished to deny entrance into the League of Nations to a Power of 70,000,000 inhabitants?" Emotional internationalism is feared, not loved, by the Catholic Church. A century's experience of European Liberal and Masonic thought has shown her how it may be coupled with radical atheism and used as a cloak for religious persecution.

Ferdinand Buisson, Briand's former chief, who died on February 16, not a month previous to Briand himself,

was a co-winner of the Nobel peace prize in 1927. His efforts in behalf of world peace were instrumental in the creation of the League of Nations. Yet to the end of his ninety-one years of life he implacably pursued the furtherance of irreligious education in France, and continued to progress as steadily away from Christian ideas as Briand continued to move steadily towards them. Masonic pacifism can win no commendation from the Church.

The words of a Belgian patriot, Count Louis de Lichtervelde, in the *Revue Catholique des Idées et des Faits* for January 7, 1927, indicate what the Church approved of in Briand's methods:

The Church, which never ceases to pray for peace, the Church, which looks upon war as a chastisement from God, is favorable a priori to every policy of conciliation and understanding. No one can doubt that Vatican diplomacy prefers Briand's manner to that of M. Poincaré. In solving practical problems touching the relations of Church and State, she has never made us of the rigorously logical methods of the Prime Minister [Poincaré] . . . She instinctively prefers transactions to conflicts. Intransigent in doctrine and principles, she makes allowance, in applying them, for human errors and weaknesses and the force of unchained passions. The method which she prefers for herself is necessarily the method which she prefers for others. As a spiritual power she desires, above all things, the pacification of minds (*la pacification des esprits*). Such pacification is not possible, in the state of things bequeathed to us by the Treaty of Versailles, save by following the path of Locarno.

But there was more than mere method that the Church recognized in Briand. It is the fact that Briand, in the midst of a thousand transactions and ten thousand arguments, steadily progressed towards the understanding of that great ethical concept which the Church regards as basic for the reign of international peace, that of a community of nations founded on justice and charity, not on mere adjustment of economic or political forces. At the signing of the Treaty of Locarno, says the annual "Survey of International Affairs":

A prophetic note crept, not into all the speeches, but into some, and most notably those made by the delegates of Germany, France, and Belgium, of a Europe in which the nations should be not only more amicable, but more closely knit than they are today. "In the light of these treaties [said M. Briand], we are Europeans only . . . if they are not the draft of a constitution of a European family within the orbit of the League of Nations, they would be frail indeed."

The actual plan of the European Federation was, of course, for Briand the concrete expression of that idea. But sickness and death laid their hand on him before his idea could progress further; and the plan of the European Federation had to stand aside to make room for the new, dissolving factor of the world economic crisis which even his astuteness could not foresee.

I say "progressed towards"; for what the Church recognized in Briand was not an entire adherence to the Catholic ideal of international ethics. To have reached, this, with his previous record, with his heritage of Masonic ideology, his lifelong association with unbelievers and sectaries, would have required an entirely supernatural conversion, probably a miracle of grace. The marvel, however, is that he moved as far and steadily forward as he did; and that concepts and methods advanced harmoni-

ously together. The future study of Briand's career may show us that he advanced about as far in this particular line of ethical development as was likely for a politician whose antecedents were those of nineteenth-century Liberalism and who never attained, beyond certain far-off intuitions, to the light of supernatural revelation. His projects of European Federation, however typically Masonic in their implications, provide a framework for Christian international relations.

The depression, under whose shadow Briand passed away, may be the bridge over which spirits kindred to him in experience and in longings shall cross to true Christian ideals. If so, we can all the more readily understand why the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris breathed the Church's merciful blessing upon the mortal remains of this statesman whose instincts dimly revealed to him as the great Friend that Christ whom he had once dreaded as the great Enemy.

Bowing the Knee to Burchard

CHARLES WILLIS THOMPSON

IN the morning of October 29, 1884, the Republican candidate for President, James G. Blaine, stood facing a man who was talking in the Fifth Avenue Hotel, New York City. The man was a Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Dr. Samuel Dickinson Burchard. Blaine was apparently listening to him, but in reality not hearing a word. He had just arrived from a brilliantly successful campaign tour in the West; the election was only a few days away, and now all he had to do was to attend a great dinner in his honor that night at Delmonico's, and then go home to wait for the returns. The coming dinner was the big thing of the day, the last big thing of the campaign; and Blaine's mind was busy with the speech he would make to the "captains of industry," as they were called, who were to give it. Then for Maine and rest.

But a candidate is not master of his own time. There are a lot of inescapable and boresome formalities that must be gone through with, every day, lest a few votes be lost. So it was on October 29. That forenoon it was necessary for the preoccupied Blaine to meet a group of clergymen who were to assure him that they were not going to follow in the wake of Henry Ward Beecher and other ministers of more celebrity than they, and bolt over into the Democratic camp. It was a grind, but not much of a grind; Blaine had only to listen to some perfunctory speech of welcome or other, say a few non-committal words of gratitude in reply, and escape back into his hotel room.

So he stood there, his mind busy with other things. Before him, on top of the corridor stairway leading from the street to the first floor, stood Dr. Burchard, who had been selected by the ministers to make the speech of welcome. Reporters flanked the candidate, but they were not listening to Burchard either; it was just another of those routine campaign inconsequences, of which they had encountered a dozen a day in accompanying Blaine in the West, and had never found one worth reporting. They were waiting only for whatever stereotyped thing Blaine might say in answer, and their paragraph would read something like this: "The Rev. Dr. S. D. Burchard; on behalf of the delegation, made a short address of welcome, to which Mr. Blaine replied as follows." No need of listening to Burchard just for that; better, for news purposes, to keep eyes on the candidate, note his manner, the effect of the long trip on his physical trim,

his vivacity of utterance or lack of it, and similar little details that the public likes to read about.

Dr. Burchard was no orator. He spoke in a dull, monotonous voice that conduced more to slumber than to enthusiasm. Decidedly, his delivery was bad. It made no difference anyway, for who cared what platitudes he might utter? The big news event was to be tonight at Delmonico's, when Andrew Carnegie, Cyrus W. Field, and Blaine's other hosts were to sit at table with him and testify dramatically how strongly the business men of New York were for him.

So it befell that Burchard's droning sentences fell on apparently listening but uncomprehending ears—those of Blaine, conning his farewell campaign appearance tonight, and on those of the reporters, mentally already writing the "story of Blaine's day," in which this unimportant bit of routine would be dismissed in a couple of paragraphs. But one of those droning sentences was this:

"We are Republicans, and don't propose to leave our party and identify ourselves with the party whose antecedents have been Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion."

It was a backhanded slap at Mr. Beecher and other Republican ministers who, in Burchard's mind, had done just that thing. It passed unheeded—unheeded by all save one. The Democratic National Committee had a sleuth following Blaine around, to pick up any unconsidered trifle that might make good campaign ammunition. His mind, unlike the minds of the reporters, was intent on only that one duty, so he listened to everything, however unimportant it might seem, and he instantly saw that Burchard had lugged some dynamite into the campaign which only needed to be set off, and by him. His only anxiety was whether Blaine had heard, and whether, if he had, he would rebuke Burchard and repudiate what he had said. If he did, that would put the dynamite in a pail of water.

But Blaine gave no sign of hearing, and in fact did not hear. He had to listen to so many addresses of welcome in different cities by platitude makers, every day! And there was the big event of tonight. When Burchard stepped back among his fellow-ministers, amid a faint and formal handclapping, Blaine roused himself and said the few sentences he had arranged in his mind. He went back to his room; the reporters went to the "Amen Corner" in the hotel, as it was afterward called, compared notes, and agreed that there had been nothing

in the affair; that it had been even more than usually devoid of "news value."

The sleuth slipped out. Democratic headquarters was one block away, and he was there in sixty seconds, reporting his dynamite to Arthur Pue Gorman, William C. Whitney, and the other political sachems. It was exploded that afternoon; the city, and then the State, and then the nation, were flooded with circulars informing Catholics that Blaine had listened—with approval, so far as any one knew, and the authors of the circular did not give him the benefit of the doubt—to a speech coupling their most sacred faith with the rum rings and the enemies of the Union.

By morning the country was ablaze. Blaine was urged to repudiate the fatal sentence, but Blaine was temperamentally averse to answering attacks. The election was close. It hung on New York State, and, as Cleveland carried that State by a plurality of only 1,149, a change of but 575 votes would have made Blaine President. In that case the course of our subsequent history would have been very different; for Blaine, a statesman of brilliant mind, was antipodal to Cleveland in his view of the way to treat every single problem of the day.

"Burchard's break" became famous and still is. For some time it added a new verb to the language; whenever a politician put his foot in it, it was said that he "burchardized." It added a new noun, still heard; whenever any one makes a speech that does his candidate harm, it is said that he is So-and-So's "Burchard." When Woodrow Wilson, for instance, made his unlucky remark about being "too proud to fight," it was said everywhere that "Wilson was his own Burchard." But no unhandy orator has ever committed such wide devastation both in American politics and in the subsequent trend of history as the original Burchard, who was no political demagogue; just an obscure and hardworking minister, who thought he was merely uttering a truism and was astounded to find himself famous.

The reason I have gone at such length into this seemingly trivial but immensely important event is that I wish to call attention to the character of its long fame. Not once, in the innumerable discussions of it in the forty-eight years that followed it, have I heard or read a condemnation of the unconscious wickedness of it; only of the tactical blundering of it. Tacitly it seems to be assumed that Burchard was stupid to utter in public an idea that might be true, but the public utterance of which would only stir up the animals.

What he actually did was to indicate, in his limited and unintelligent way, a line of cleavage between one faith and others. To his mind, the minority, who stand on the other side of the line from himself, are enemies of the Republic as much as those who tried to destroy it by force and those who poisoned its spirit through the rum rings; or, for that matter, any other open enemy or secret debaucher of the Republic. Those who stand on the opposite side of the line from the Burchards must be excluded from the honors of the nation, for that nation's protection against their maleficent influence. That idea was alive before Burchard uttered it, and it is alive today.

Those who hold the Burchard idea are doubtless a minority. Therefore the most sinister sign, in 1932, is not the un-American view held by that minority, but the crooking to it, on the part of many others, of the pregnant hinges of the knee. There is less sign of boldly grappling with this abhorrent idea and throttling it forever than there is of propitiating it. A Catholic announces that, if the Democratic Convention nominates him, he will accept. Immediately there arise uneasy voices from men who do not themselves believe in Burchardism, crying out, "Don't arouse the Burchards! Don't nominate this man, it will only make them angry!" Newspapers which supported Smith zealously in 1928 in different parts of the country, even in the South, and who have no sympathy with Burchardism, are appealing to the country to pretend that there is no bigotry; to keep still about it, make believe it is not there, and cure cancer by ignoring it.

This, and this only, is the alarming and lamentable sign of the times in 1932. The evil can be cured by seeming not to know of its existence. Let us pass it by with finger on lip and eyes averted and it will do no harm. What a statesmanlike way to cope with a great peril to the Republic, the peril that is sure to show its terrible face if men are to be excluded from honor not because of their personal unfitness or even their party preferences, but because of their religious faith!

Gentlemen, you cannot cope with the evil in that way. The ghost of Burchard arises to tell you that you cannot. Cancers cannot be cured by looking the other way and talking about the weather. No nation has ever escaped a fatal disease by silence. Let us have recourse to Carlyle's "French Revolution," substituting for the word "Gironde" the word "Republic," and for the words "this day" the word "1928":

"The Gironde has touched, this day, on the foul black-spot of its domain; has trodden on it, and yet *not* trodden it down. Alas, it is a *well-spring*, this black spot; and will not tread down!"

Education

Little Mary's Insides

JOHN WILTBYE

THE school which I attended, intermittently, before I could count my years in 'teens, was not a little white house in the dell. It was on top of a rain-riven hill; outwardly, it was an offense to the eye, and within, it outraged all the known laws of hygiene, and some which at that time were only suspected. Its dominant style was pointed and perpendicular, following the general lines of a chicken coop. The name of the architect is unknown to infamy, but I trust that he is now enjoying his merited reward.

Judged by modern standards, the physical effect upon the pupils should have been frightful. We should have paled and pined, but I cannot remember that we did. Today, we demand a school room large enough to provide every pupil with a certain amount of air, measured in litres, or by some such system, and continually renewed,

so that breathing may be a healthful and invigorating exercise, instead of a species of suffocation. Lighting too, and the maintenance of just the right temperature, are other matters on which the specialists must exercise their wits. Of these oddities, our school knew nothing.

In winter, we baked, if we were near the big stove in the center of the room, and shivered when fate moved us over to the window with the cracked pane. After the stove had fairly warmed to its work, the atmosphere was of a density and specific gravity which has always made me wonder what the prisoners in the Black Hole at Calcutta had to complain of. However, even without the intervention of an oxygen tent, we breathed it, and somehow survived. Of course, in due series, we all encountered measles and mumps, whooping cough and scarlet fever, chickenpox and conjunctivitis; one lad even attained to the singular eminence of brain fever, and was held in no little envy. The other diseases were plebeian, but his was distinctive.

The times have changed indeed. Schoolmasters may doubt whether some of their charges have brains, but they have learned that every one of them has a body. Perhaps, then, education ought to take this fact into the reckoning, they have reasoned, and so teach the child how to be healthy as well as how to be wise. *Mens sana in corpore sano*, once only a tag from the Latin grammar, is beginning to assume pedagogical importance. Hence we have the school health program, the periodical health examinations, and the lessons in hygiene, which made one scandalized mother protest that it wasn't nice to learn little Mary so much about her insides; and the unwearying search for the offending tonsil, the blighting adenoid, the crumbling tooth, and the failing eye grinds on unceasingly. Unfortunately, too, with the program has arisen a host of teachers, of whom some deem the whole scheme bally nonsense, while others carry it to an extreme that falls little short of fanaticism. Few as they are, it seems to me that the fanatics have carried the day. The public appears to think so; the Catholic public, at any rate.

Extremes always provoke extremes. I have heard some critics belabor the school health program with an earnest fury, like that of a gnarled Free Silver Democrat, of Bryan's first campaign, discussing the crime of 1873. To listen to them, you would conclude that no Catholic school can possibly be Catholic unless half of its alumni have been gathered to a better world shortly after attaining the age of reason, while the other half feebly hang on to life with one foot in the grave. One grave personage, whose mental growth probably attained its absolute maximum in the Fall of 1884, rejected the cooperation of a Catholic leader in this field, on the ground that health programs make the children think too little of their souls, and too much of their bodies! "We never even knew we had tonsils," some remark, with the air, calm and detached, of one who has routed all arguments. I never knew either; but I know now.

Now these critics may be saints, who pay less attention to poor Brother Ass than did St. Francis. Or they may have possessed from the cradle, fewer nerves than an army mule, and a stronger constitution. I leave the

solution to my betters, if a solution is of any importance. But the holy follies of the Seraph of Assisi are not for our little children at school. On the contrary, we are under a grave obligation to provide to the best of our ability for their physical, as well as for their intellectual and religious, welfare.

I deduce this statement not only from Canon 1113 of the Code, but from the whole tenor of the Encyclical of Pius XI on "The Christian Education of Youth." For "Christian education," writes the Pontiff, "takes in the whole aggregate of human life, physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social, not with a view to reducing it in any way, but in order to elevate, regulate, and perfect it, in accordance with the example and teaching of Christ." Hence, the Holy Father teaches, "nor may even physical culture, as it is called, be considered outside the range of her [the Church's] supervision," and he cites for praise the numerous schools "established for the training of youth in Christian piety, together with literature and the sciences, not omitting recreation and physical culture."

I have no word of condonation for the hygienic atrocities, characteristic of the schools of fifty years ago. Yet it seems to me that an old-fashioned remedy which palliated, if it did not wholly counteract those horrors, has all but disappeared today. That remedy was the home. Odd as it may seem, parents were interested in their children, particularly mothers. But it is trite, commonplace, and, most unfortunately, quite true, that many duties which parents of a former generation gladly fulfilled, are now turned over to the school. Simple lessons in hygiene are not taught at home, either because parents have no leisure to teach, or do not know what to teach. Once upon a time, it was thought that mother could and would care for Johnny when he suffered from an earache. Today Johnny's ear will probably continue to ache until it culminates in chronic otitis, unless teacher takes him to a clinic.

The fact is, after all, that schools exist and teachers work, to supplement the best of all training, that, namely, which is given in the home. True, the line must be drawn somewhere; but, from a practical point of view, it seems that the school must accept the burdens shifted to it from parental shoulders, and plan its course accordingly. The Catholic school, in keeping with the spirit of Canon 1113, feels itself bound to use every means at its disposal to educate the child. But education implies, according to that Canon, "physical and civic training."

Glancing at a news bulletin of the N. C. W. C. as I close this page, I note that the diocesan Catholic school superintendents are to discuss this very topic at their meeting in Washington next week, under the chairmanship of that experienced educator, the Rev. John M. Wolfe, S.T.D., Ph.D., of Dubuque. They realize its importance, and I hope that through a campaign of publicity they can make the Catholic public realize it. Too many Catholics still think that school health programs mean nothing but talks which unduly center little Mary's attention on the anatomical, pathological, and therapeutical aspects of her insignificant insides.

Economics

Marked Cards and Loaded Dice

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

WHEN Mrs. Raddle planted herself firmly on a purple cauliflower in the Kidderminster carpet, she had not arrived, but had only come to one more turning in a very crooked lane. That was clear to one and all in Lant Street, the Borough, and particularly to the lady herself. Mr. Sawyer was in her debt for a quarter and a month or so, touching a certain matter of fresh butter, lump sugar, and milk, duly delivered: which debt he was able to meet only as we meet this depression, that is, by saying that it would probably be over by the middle of next week. "I have no doubt, Mrs. Raddle," said this prophetic financier, "that before the middle of next week we shall be able to set ourselves square, and go on a better system afterwards."

Mrs. Raddle was not appeased, as you will remember, but promptly let off steam. In this, she was remarkably like us. We are not appeased, either, by the promises of prosperity for the middle of next week. Ever since 1929, when this blight began, we have been listening to assurances that it would not last beyond sixty days. The genius of the American people, we heard, was equal to all demands, and stable prosperity was just around the corner. What appeared to be the wreck of the old glazed hat was only a dent, which the application of a finger would restore to pristine smoothness. These assurances came from Wall street, and from the heads of great corporations. They came from Washington, and even from sundry Great Personages enshrined therein. So we lived on hope, a thin provender, but we had no other.

You have but to look over a file of newspapers from, approximately, October, 1929 to January, 1932, to realize that these consolers were all Bob Sawyers. They had no reason whatever for saying that we could get square before the middle of next week. They simply took for granted that, unlike Mrs. Raddle, we would bolt their prophecy without testing it. We did, too; but now that nearly a third of us are teetering on the verge of the poor house (with the odds in favor of the poor house) we are at last beginning to let off steam. We are through with Bob Sawyer and his astrological finance. Or we ought to be.

It is possible that we shall be "able to set ourselves square," although at a date much more remote than the middle of next week. We may find it possible to balance the budget, Federal and local, by assuming the heaviest taxation the country has ever known in times of peace. That this balance is a blessing, when it connotes a system which means that people with very little money are to be forced to pay more money for the ordinary commodities of life, while the rest go without, I do not presume to say. But it seems to be the plan proposed by the wise men at Washington and in the State capitals, and who am I to question them? Perhaps it will open the factories, put the unemployed to work, create new and profitable markets, and draw the dimes out of the old sock, thus allow-

ing the banks to accumulate more dead reserves of idle gold. Somehow, some time, by some means, we shall balance the budget. But does that mean that we "shall go on a better system afterward"?

Not one sign on the horizon indicates that the return to a balance means the adoption of "a better system." As far as I can read the signs, the barons of the financial world are anxious to insure the return of normal conditions, only that they may go on farther with the old discredited system.

Glance for a moment at the market as it was in the early months of 1929. Everybody was as happy as a tipsy sailor on shore leave, and was spending money like that mariner too. Prices rocketed sky-high, but that made no difference when every purse was full. Goods of all sorts, real and hypothetical, changed hands every night. Owners were willing to sell, since they sold at an advance, and prospective buyers bought, not to hold and develop, but to sell on a rising market, even if they got only a trifle more than they had paid. Banks and bond houses went mad. Old, respectable firms floated so-called securities, and urged their clients to invest their savings in projects so flimsy that by comparison John Law's bubble was as solid as a billiard ball. It chilled no investor's optimism to discover that the bank which sold the securities usually declined to accept them as collateral. Every poor little gamester dreamed of wealth. But it was a wealth secured without work, a wealth not predicated on real values, a wealth on paper, but not in fact, a wealth that was a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. By December, 1930, looking back on a year of wreckage, most of us knew it.

Perhaps the whole country was mad at that time, and hence—perhaps—no one is at fault. But I observe from the latest edition of the "World Almanac" that our biggest millionaires are still the world's biggest. The bankers and the officials in high place who now utter mournful complaints, had no complaint, and not even a warning, in the old hectic days. Is it possible that no one among them all had an eye that saw the future, at least in fairly correct outline? That is possible. Indeed, I think it is probable. They were in every sense children of their rotten capitalistic day, and under capitalism, as it exists in this country, business is not a matter of careful calculation of ascertained facts, in which any man of intelligence and probity, granted fair talent for this occupation, can profitably engage. It is, rather, a gambling game, which can be very successfully played with marked cards and loaded dice. Sometimes, a blackjack is useful.

If that statement seems extreme, I ask you to consider this. We of the English-speaking countries are the heirs of an alleged Christian philosophy which in practice, means a pagan philosophy. As a religious-minded man, you may abhor easy divorce and contraception; as a practical man, you employ these devices, in a spiritual manner of course, and for supernatural motives, as Lambeth bids us, when not to employ them stands in the way of advancement. We—to erase the invidious pronoun—go to church every Sunday, but we see no reason why what we learn there should be the rule of our business for the

other six days. In general, this philosophy means that religion is a most excellent thing in its way; still, we feel that the Lord never meant it to be a block and a hindrance to our upward progress. That would be fanaticism, whereas the true purpose of religion is to smooth life's rough pathway. Thus religion supplies a spiritual element lacking in the steel and iron business. It is compensation when, after driving a hard bargain with an orphan, one can put a ten-dollar bill on the plate. For some of us in our hours of weariness, it is an anodyne more soothing than a saccharine tale of love or a tear-jerking drama. But if it is not life's root motive, religion can't be anything better than this cloak of hypocrisy. For, as Brown-ing says, with unusual clarity, religion must be all, or it is nothing.

As far as I have been able to observe, religion is certainly not "all" in this country. I never heard of a sizable corporation which based all its operations on justice and charity to the employee. On the contrary, business is business, which means that a profit must be squeezed out, unless there is actual peril that the squeezing process will land the squeezers in Sing Sing or Atlanta. That is why we Americans buy more worthless securities than any people in the world, and why in no country does the gold brick command so remarkable a premium.

It also explains why large groups of thimble riggers can operate as bankers and brokers. They urge the public to invest, and this creates "value." Then they slip the pea under the other shell, and that creates a break in the market. It will be firm enough tomorrow, or not, as they elect, and as the number of suckers in sight may warrant. This is finance—a process carried on with as little respect to real values as to the Decalogue. Like Artemus Ward's showman, they haven't got a principle, and would not know what to do with one, in their business. Should their weekday conscience trouble them, it can be soothed and pacified by teaching a bible class on Sunday morning, and knocked out again for the full count on Monday morning.

No, I see no sign of any return to "a better system." The introduction of justice and charity as basic principles in commerce and finance would be the only sign worth considering. But under capitalism, as we have it in this country, that would be considered folly.

A WOMAN OF JERUSALEM

I cannot hush my sobs that since the morn
Have sounded, left my very soul grief-wet;
I saw a Man, Whom I shall not forget,
Clotted His hair with blood and piercing thorn,
Purpled His visage with the brutal blow,
Bent low beneath a cross, His failing feet
Creeping piteously along the street
I saw His Mother, broken with her woe.

Sickened, I shrank against a jutting wall
With others, sheltering my streaming eyes,
He turned toward us, spoke . . . ah, swift surmise!
Who was this Man? I cannot utter all
Nor argue well who am but unlearned clod,
But this I know . . . I know that He was God!

VERA MARIE TRACY.

Back of Business

THE sales tax is before the country. The American manufacturer, according to present plans, will be charged $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent on his products. The manufacturing output is less than \$30,000,000,000, the tax revenue is expected to be in the neighborhood of \$600,000,000. The sales tax is one attempt to cover the \$2,000,000,000 deficit of the Federal Government. The manufacturer can meet the increased overhead in two ways: either by paying the charge of $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent out of his profits, or by including it in his prices. He, no doubt, will choose the latter alternative. The tax will in its entirety be passed on to the consumer. In this lies the injustice of the tax.

The consumer will be called upon to pay as high a sales tax, in proportion, whether he can afford a fifty-cent book or a \$500,000 yacht. This is unfair. We are all willing to contribute to the cost of government, but it should be done in the right proportion. We would not ask a first-class executive to work for \$15 a week, nor would we expect the President of the United States to accept the average per-hour wage of the American people, which would be something like fifty cents. Yet, we expect with this sales tax big people and small, paupers and millionaires, to drop in at the stores and the shops and pay all the same proportionate tax of $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. This is grossly unfair.

Contribution to the cost of government should be based not on what a man needs (for who could do without food and shelter and clothing?) but on what a man earns. Then, there would be common sense to taxation; some would earn little and pay minimum taxes; others would make big money and be taxed in proportion. But under the proposed plan, even the man who is unemployed and walking the streets would be made to pay his "share."

Yet, in the opinion of this writer, the sales tax will pass Congress as sure as spring is at the door. It will be passed because Congress is a political institution whereas taxation is an economic issue. We have no Federal authority in economics, and therefore we must expect that great economic mistakes will be made by a body which is lacking in the fundamentals of economic knowledge, of economic experience, and of economic background. We would laugh at the idea of scrubbing the living room with a tooth brush. But day in and day out we take most seriously the political debates of grave economic issues in Congress.

It is a grave mistake to rob the public of a prospective spending power to the extent of \$600,000,000, at a time when recovery hinges upon the principle of buying and buying so that we may start this huge industrial machinery of ours on the way to increased production. We should tax where the money is *not* taken away from people's spending power: the large stockholders, the real-estate magnates, the influential bondholders, those that possess majority rights in large-scale industries. This sort of money would be taken from production channels. And it would do us no harm if the abundant finance of industry would be cut a bit. GERHARD HIRSCHFELD.

The Resurrection Mysteries

JOHN GILLAND BRUNINI

THE RESURRECTION

Awake and praise, O dwellers in the dust!
The dew of this new everlasting spring
Is singing on the garden hill, the trust
Of death is broken; now will seas disclose
Their dead, earth's slain will rise again. For He
Who has not known corruption is not here—He goes
Before to Galilee. Awake and see
The sepulchre unsealed, the stone rolled back,
The winding sheets still reeled, the angels limned in light.
O Mary, Mary and Salome, seek
Him not among the dead, the heavy night
Of Adam's guilt is fled, the Temple is rebuilt,
The stone rejected of the builders now is made
The cornerstone.

Rejoice, rejoice, this is the day!
O Magdalen, who knew not where they laid
Your Lord, discard your spices, gather bay,
The Victim has become the Victor! He,
The Way, the Truth, the Life, is risen! O behold!
The Shepherd glorified has shown His sheep to fold!

THE ASCENSION

O come unto the hill, the numbered days
Are here. The throne of God recalls its Own,
Angelic trumpets gird the firmament with praise,
And glorified the Father glorifies His Son.
Why wonder you, O men of Galilee,
Why seek the heaven of the heavens to the east?
He came from God—

O sing a jubilee!
The clouds have parted. He has pierced the blue.
Amen, amen! It is expedient that He
Should go to send the Paraclete to you.
The time of parable is almost passed,
The Holy Ghost will make your eyes to see
The beauty of the Eucharistic mystery—
O Peter feed His lambs and feed His sheep!
Those words the Father gave He kept, where He
Has sown good seed His laborers must reap
The holy harvest of His Bread and Wine.
He has prepared a table—

O, you soon will know
The Vine abides in you and you in Him
Until He comes as you have seen Him go!

THE DESCENT OF THE HOLY GHOST

Of what avail these willing finite minds
That now, bewildered, ponder prophecy
And parable?

Hark, hark, the rushing winds!
All sound is poised upon their mighty beat,
The rhythm of their flight suspends all thought,
The very air astounds this cenacle retreat
And, lo! on Mary and the apostolic twelve
The Cloven Tongues of Fire flame. All, all
The shackles of the senses fall, they see the Light—
These children of the Light, they know the call—
"Go forth and teach all nations."

This new rite
Of confirmation sanctifies the Truth, the fruits
The Vine has borne are purged—lift up your hearts,
O orphans now no longer!

Love confutes

The wicked, justice is the girdle of your loins
And faith the girdle of your wills. O be
Wise as the serpent, simple as the dove,
The wolves will flee your fortitude and piety,
The sheep will shelter in your words of love
And in the ends of earth your divers tongues
Will praise the mercies of the Cross.

Let down your net—

The fish will close its many meshes cast
In waters known and distant seas that fret
Strange hidden coasts more dangerous than these.
Behold! He is with you all days—the keys
That loose and bind are in the rock nor shall the gates
Of hell prevail against these mysteries.

THE ASSUMPTION

O heart submissive in this martyrdom
Of love, this exile weary in the long, long years
Beyond the Cross is ended—death, like rain
On fleece, has gently brought release.

O Mary, tears

Were oft, too oft, your drink, the swords of pain
Were cruel in your soul—at last, at last,
His Will has caught your breath.

O seraphs sing!

Among the blessed she is highest blest,
She shelters men beneath the covert of her wing,
Exalt her like a cedar on the crest
Of Lebanon, a rose and cypress tree
By waters of the plain.

Sweet above fine honey, she

Has taken mystic root in God and bloomed,
Her petals are perfumed in mercy, dewed in love,
Her leaves are burgeoned in compassion.

Sweet as myrrh

And cassia is her fragrance, holy is her well
Of purity, her brook has found the sea of grace,
The Mother of fair love has come to dwell
In God—O angels praise the glory of her face!

THE CORONATION OF THE VIRGIN

Exultant seraphim and cherubim
Have led her to the Mighty Throne, her feet
Have trod the carpet of the clouds, the hymn
Of firmaments has sounded great and sweet
And Mary, tremulous with love, looks on her Son.
O Tower of Ivory, O House of Gold,
O Morning Star, the choir of Virtues sings
New canticles of joy. O Virgin, who extolled
The Word made-flesh, the glory of the days of kings
Must pale before your mirrored majesty
Of meekness, fairest lilies of the field
Must flush to see your peerless purity,
And frankincense and myrrh must burn to yield
More aromatic sweetness.

Principalities

And Powers have reaped the light of night to weave
This twelve-starred diadem of clemency—
Kneel, kneel, O Mother of the World, receive
The crown from Jesus.

Thrones, proclaim the litany!

Hail, angels, hail your Queen, new Queen of Peace,
Queen of All Saints, Queen of the Holy Rosary.

With Scrip and Staff

MODERN scientific child study, growing apace in elaboration and influence, calls more and more for the critical judgment of Catholics. 141 separate agencies, local, national, international, were indexed in the *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for September, 1930, as concerned with child-study research in some shape or form. With the exception of the League of Nations agencies, all of these were in the United States; so that a far greater army could be mustered from abroad. Obviously we cannot swallow the new "science" whole. Yet, equally obviously, we cannot ignore it, or condemn it without reserve.

Roughly speaking, there are four dominant traits in this modern scientific child study which repel the Catholic educator: disproportion; pedantry; error; and omission.

Disproportion is seen in the undue preoccupation with trifling matters in which some of the modern investigators indulge. Pedantry, in that enthusiasm for a barrage of technical terminology and elaborate methods of presenting simple facts, which has fascination for meticulous minds. Error, either in erroneous explanations of human phenomena, as in the theories of the Behaviorists and the Freudians; or the linking up of legitimate and verifiable research with unscientific speculations that have nothing to do with the case.

The principal omissions are the spirituality of the soul, with its consequent relation to the motivation of human conduct; and the supernatural end of man, with its correlative supernatural aids and graces. Hence a distorted concept of character arises, with a corresponding perversion of educational technique.

CATHOLIC educators, however, believe, that with all these handicaps, much that is precious has been assembled by the modern child-research specialists. Disproportion, pedantry, and omission of essential explanations have characterized most individual fields of human knowledge, whether sacred or profane, when allowed to run riot without due checking up from other kindred fields. The pedantic, or seemingly pedantic terminology, may throw light on ancient truths, though expressed in a modern dress. Such is the opinion of the Parent Educator Committee of the Catholic Rural Life Conference, which has just issued the second volume of its annual booklets entitled: *The Parent Educator*.

In a brief statement by the Rev. Dr. John M. Cooper, of the Catholic University of America, which prefaces a series of papers on the problems of parents as educators of their children, we are reminded of the omissions: "contemporary non-Catholic studies in moral education neglect entirely or almost entirely the supernatural means and motives." However, "these studies have given us a great deal of valuable new information on the use of natural motives and means. Some of this new information may be used with profit by the Catholic educator, if he definitely and carefully subordinates the natural means and motives to the supernatural ones." One point, particularly, is noted:

It is, however, chiefly in the field of the capital sins and the occasions of sins that the Catholic educator can derive much information and many suggestions from these non-Catholic studies, to help him in his work of moral education. What the non-Catholic calls "the subjective and environmental factors in delinquency" correspond in the main to what the Church traditionally understands by the capital sins and by the occasions of sin respectively. Our newer scientific . . . studies of such factors . . . have thrown a flood of lights upon the capital sins and the occasions of sin as these operate under our modern social conditions.

In his Encyclical on Christian Education, our Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, has called attention to "the present-day lamentable decline in family education. The offices and professions of a transitory and earthly life, which are certainly of far less importance, are prepared for by long and careful study, whereas for the fundamental duty and obligation of educating their children, many parents have little or no preparation, immersed as they are in temporal cares."

PARENTS will find helpful suggestions for physical and moral training of their children in the pages of *The Parent Educator*, which may be obtained from St. Anthony's Guild, Paterson, N. J., for fifty cents a copy. The first paper in the series, that of Sister Mary, I.H.M., on "The Religious Concepts of Children of Pre-School Age," was mentioned earlier by the Pilgrim. The author deplores the fact that visual education "evidently is not used to any great extent in religious training in the home. . . Is it not sad to think that, at five years of age, from forty to fifty per cent of our Catholic children do not know our Blessed Mother in any ordinary holy picture of Christmas or the Crucifixion?"

The day, however, that the Pilgrim first read her words he had the happiness to visit a home in which the mother commended the benefit her own children had obtained from pictures illustrating the truths of the Faith. In that same home, both father (a non-Catholic, and an eminent scientist), and mother knelt each night to recite the Rosary with their children.

Personality development; health; recreation; and the problems of children in handicapped families are all treated with fresh and practical observations. Some of these might be read profitably in connection with National Child Health Day, which occurs on May 1. Dr. Ellamay Horan shows how the child's play, under the parents' guidance, may be used to great advantage as a means of building good habits.

Modern educational historians deprecate the Catholic school tradition of "prefecting" the school boy or girl while at play. Yet, when sympathetically practised, prefecting does for the older child what the parents co-operation does for the little one: ensures, by observation and suggestion, that play shall aid in the development of character.

FAMILIARITY with the wheat, as well as the chaff, that has been garnered in the barns of modern child research, will enable the Catholic educator better to assay sentimental anxiety over "school sickness" from "pressure," which some theorists, such as Dr. James F.

Rogers, are now urging as a ground for serious alarm.

Study of child psychology, for instance, may show "school sickness" to be a means of escape from unwelcome tasks. (See *The Parent Educator*, p. 22.)

Moreover, are not the present apostles of dynamism and adaptation to the changing age, as J. H. S. Bossard, or John Dewey, responsible for that crowding of the curriculum, that premature introducing of the child to mental situations beyond its grasp, which produce disgust? The changes in modern life, says Dr. Ogburn of the University of Chicago, "bring possibilities, but also dangers for the child." And does not the child crave authoritative teaching as its natural right, if he is later, in the words of that veteran Southern educator, Dr. James Hardy Dillard, to "play the man"?

FUTURE Catholic child students might do well to analyze from the standpoint of educational psychology, some of the great heritage of proverbs concerning the training of little children, which are found in Catholic countries. Here are a few, from a hundred that were collected by the German-American *Sendbote des heiligen Herzens Jesu*, for October, 1931:

Up to his fifth year, the child is your master; up to his tenth, he is your servant; up to his fifteenth your counselor; and after that he is either your friend or your enemy.

Children are the pledge of wedded life, mother's best playmates, the blessing on the house, the poor man's riches.

Children have their angels.

Children speak the truth. (Sincerity.)

Little children tread on your feet; grown children tread on your heart.

Children learn as much with their eyes as they do with their ears.

Children ought not to know that their parents have money.

Children notice more what old folks do than what they say.

A child can never get another mother, but the father can get another wife.

Much-loved children have many names.

One third of a child takes after its father.

Little children, little cares; big children, big cares.

A poor child is as happy in playing with pennies as a rich child with gold coins.

A child that does not play and does not wag its tongue is not healthy.

A lively child wants to see everything; you should go along with it and show it.

If the child has no appetite for bread, do not give it cake.

A child regards every man, as that man regards his own parents.

A short time suffices to learn to talk; a lifetime may not teach how to keep silence.

A child must learn to pray at its mother's knees.

The child will tell you that it has been whipped; but it will not tell you what for.

Man lasts so short a while; yet it costs so much to raise him!

Children are the parents' bridge to Heaven.

Why folk wisdom is so unduly hard on stepmothers I do not know (one saying declares that they "look best in a green dress," like Prince Lennart of Sweden and his plebeian bride). Yet many a little one *has* found another mother, despite the old saws. In general the proverbs hit the mark: temper authority with mildness, and lead the child to God, who is the center of his "adjustment" and of all his "poise."

THE PILGRIM.

Dramatics

Moon in Yellow River Is Spring Freshet of Words

ELIZABETH JORDAN

IN an effort to embody his notion of the general futility of life Ezra Pound once wrote these lines:

And Li Po also died drunk.

He tried to embrace a moon in the Yellow River.

When Denis Johnston felt the urge to express the same conviction he quoted Li Po's fate in the program of his new play, "The Moon in the Yellow River," which the Theater Guild is now presenting at the Guild Theater. He also required a three-act drama, and an outlay of many thousands of dollars, to express the same idea Ezra Pound had put into sixteen words. Moreover, measuring Mr. Johnston's hundred-thousand-odd words against Mr. Pound's sixteen, the audience makes the melancholy discovery that it gets a very definite idea from Mr. Pound's sixteen words, and no ideas whatever from Mr. Johnston's hundred-thousand words. It is merely overwhelmed by a spring freshet of words from which it emerges gasping and mentally strangled.

Due credit, perhaps, should be given to Claude Rains, who, by delivering most of his lines under his breath, spares the audience the necessity of hearing them and thus slightly reduces the force of the verbal deluge. But he really deserves no praise for this. His effort is not a humane one. He is merely following the strange new notion that many actors cherish today, the notion that the words of a play must be kept a secret from the audience. Numerous plays have been wrecked by this conviction. In the present offering it neither helps nor hinders. There are still countless thousands of words to spare.

The pity of it all is that there is the suggestion of a real play in this new Irish drama. Its direction and acting, of course, are all they should be. It has its moments of humor, of pathos, of drama. But if there is any plot in it, or even any central idea beyond the hint that nothing is worth while, its crashing torrents of words wash them away.

There is a revolution in the Irish Free State. We don't know why. It is led by a young fire-brand named Blake, a "varsity man" who originally fought for Ireland's freedom. Why he is dissatisfied with it now neither he nor the audience knows. He is prepared to blow up the power house of a Bavarian engineer who has come to a Free State village to supply this power house to the Government. The young leader is utterly indifferent to the amount of property or the number of lives he may destroy in this effort. He suggests that buildings near the plant be set on fire that the destruction of the plant itself may be swifter and more effective. He drinks himself drunk and harangues against the machine age. In the end he is killed by the Commandant of the Free State forces. No one knows why. Perhaps it is the Commandant's idea of good, clean fun. But the audience

agrees with that quick-fingered officer that the fire-brand's country will be better off without him.

As another study in futility we have one Dobelle, an Irish engineer whose wife died at the birth of their one child and who has never forgiven the child for the tragedy. She is fourteen when the play begins, a charming girl—beautifully impersonated by Gertrude Flynn—and still vainly trying to understand why her father has neither love for nor interest in her. At the end of the play he discovers for the first time that she looks like her mother. He sits down, takes her into his arms and for ten minutes whispers into her back hair. It was at this point, I think, that I had the most refreshing nap of the current theatrical season; though I have had several good ones this winter. When I awoke Dobelle was still whispering and his daughter's hair was badly blown about. That draught must be bad for Gertrude Flynn, who may be one of our American stars some day if she lives through it. In the interests of art, I suggest a Tam O'Shanter for her during the remainder of the season.

If one gets any impression at all from the play, aside from that of its appalling wordiness and incredible vagueness, it is that it may be intended as an arraignment of the Irish temperament and an expression of Mr. Johnston's doubts that Irish freedom can survive. All he has demonstrated is that his play cannot survive.

The part of the young leader is admirably acted by Henry Hull. William Harrigan does a fine bit of work as the Commandant, and Egan Brecher is sincere and ingratiating as the German engineer. If the play were up to its direction and company—but why say more?

Not many years ago Mr. A. A. Milne was one of England's most delightful humorists. He was an editor of *Punch*. He wrote captivating stories and jingles for children. He wrote comedies which made the world smile happily. Then fame and fortune came to him, and he turned bitter. He decided that everything was all wrong. Perhaps the sudden warp in his nature was the result of too frequently being called "whimsical." It is said he violently objected to this description. Whatever the explanation, here he is, the world's finest example of the corroding power of success. Personally, I never believed that success was especially corroding. I am a convert since I saw Mr. Milne's latest comedy, "They Don't Mean Any Harm," presented by Charles H. Hopkins at the Charles H. Hopkins Theater.

In this play Mr. Milne shows us the fatal effects of trying to help anybody in any way. Four intellectuals, two young men and their wives, endeavor, as a new interest, to aid a poor family in their building. The mother of the family has been a helpless cripple for twenty years. They get one of London's greatest surgeons to examine her. He pronounces her easily curable, takes her to his own private sanitarium, and performs the operation—all without expense to the patient or her family. Unfortunately she died, and Mr. Milne calls on Heaven to witness the callousness of the intellectuals' act. They should have let her continue to suffer and be lame. She was so happy thus! The play was taken off so briskly that the actors and actresses hardly had time to sit down in the

nice new chairs Mr. Hopkins had bought for the production.

It is a comfort to praise something—and don't I wish producers would give me more chances to do it! John Golden made three vain efforts. Now, to the satisfaction of his friends and his audiences (really the same thing) his new offering is an excellent melodrama—"Riddle Me This"—which is nightly filling the John Golden Theater. Incidentally, he gives us two stars in it, Frank Craven and Thomas Mitchell; and both are at their best.

The play begins where most murder plays leave off, with the discovery of the murderer. Dr. Ernest Tindal (Charles Richman) has finished, just as the curtain rises, his horrible crime of murdering his faithless wife. Her dead body lies on the floor in her bedroom. He is now engaged, before the eyes of the spectators, in surrounding the act with evidence which will convict another man, her lover, of the crime; and he is so successful in this that the lover is within twenty minutes of death in the electric chair before the real criminal is discovered. Then it is a young reporter (Frank Craven) who runs him to earth. No one is surprised. By this time all play-goers know how much more brilliant sleuths young newspaper men are than real detectives! Be that as it may, the murderer pays, and the audience has a fascinating evening watching first the police following the wrong clues and then the reporter discovering the right ones. There is a general rejoicing over Mr. Golden's success, which must warm the producer's heart. He is personally as popular as George M. Cohan and Otis Skinner.

There's another success in town, a gay little English comedy, "There's always Juliet" brought over from London by Gilbert Miller and produced at the Empire Theater with Edna Best and Herbert Marshall in the leading roles. The new comedy is the sort all producers dream of and which few can make come true. It has only one set, Juliet's London living room, and only four characters, Juliet, her two admirers, and her maid. Its cost is little and its profits are great. The chances are that at least a year or two will elapse before Mr. Miller, outraged by his country's lack of appreciation, again leaves us forever, as he does periodically.

For the rest, "Juliet" is a fascinating trifle, all love-making and light comedy. There is quick action, too; for the lovers, who first meet on a Tuesday, are married and sailing for America the following Saturday morning. Perhaps the finest triumph of the production is that Herbert Marshall plays the American lover without throwing in an English accent. So few English actors can do that.

Sam Janney's thriller, originally called "Monkey" and recently rechristened "Inspector Henderson" is another murder play, in which through the efforts of a super-detective following up a murder, the criminal is discovered and executed within one short evening. Incidentally, Henderson, the super-detective, talks every minute, tears up any evidence that does not appeal to him, and generally conducts himself like the man-monkey who used to entertain us on the stage of the Palace Theater. His specialty is intuition. He "knows" when anyone is lying

to him; he "knows" when anyone around him is crooked; he "knows" the innocent from the guilty; and he knows how to set traps into which murderers will walk unquestioningly. It is all very interesting, and not in the least convincing. Nobody minds that. Richard Whorf plays the eccentric inspector very well and Officer McSweeney (Edward McNamara) ought to be transferred immediately to the Guild Theater. Then there would be one genuine and appealing Irishman in "The Moon in the Yellow River," and the new Guild play might have a chance.

One has a strange feeling during the performance of "The Laugh Parade," the new revue in which Ed Wynn is presenting himself and his company at the Imperial Theater. It is so fresh, so charming, so amusing, and so clean! The last quality is the incredible one—and *that's* a nice condition to exist in our theaters. In almost every other musical offering in town, except "The Cat and The Fiddle," there is sickening and frequent vulgarity of word or action or both. Wynn's production might be shown at a prep school. Yet it is sophisticated, thoroughly modern, beautiful to the eye and ear, and so amusing that one goes around for days quoting its various "wise-cracks." Every reader of AMERICA should see it. (And I do hope none of them will find in it some little verbal cockroach which I in my innocence failed to observe, and write me about it. That's what *usually* happens when I praise a musical comedy!)

REVIEWS

The Shadow of the Pope. By MICHAEL WILLIAMS. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. \$3.00.

The Editor of the *Commonweal* has undertaken the task, long overdue, of putting together the documents we possess on the anti-Catholic movement in the United States. He has done it well. With most unusual calm he sets down the most atrocious calumnies against us; he never utters a single damn. His forbearance is almost superhuman, and the result justifies his self-control. To all but the most fanatic, the objective story he has to tell dispenses him from any condemnation. He answers no accusations; his method forces him to take the risk that the unenlightened, for whom the book is not written, will believe the atrocities mentioned. Beginning with a short sketch of Colonial times, Mr. Williams takes us through the Native American and Know Nothing riots and bloodshed, the A. P. A. political intrigues, the writhings of the *Menace* and its spawn. The larger half of the book is then given to a detailed story of the Ku Klux Klan, the campaign of 1924, and the calamitous religious strife of 1928. Nearly 150 pages are devoted to this last phase. Large quotations are given from anti-Catholic writings, and the book is enlivened with dozens of horrible illustrations. The responsibility is placed squarely where it belongs, with the lunatic fringe of Protestantism, the baser sort of scandal mongers for money, and the political parsons. He does not overlook the fact that a strong anti-Catholic bias existed also among the respectable and the intelligent, though it did not take the gross forms it took among the lower strata, while at the same time he gives full credit to those Protestants who openly abhorred both the spirit and methods of the Kluxer. He throws no new light on the connection between the anti-Catholic campaign and the Republican National Committee, and is content to rest on the implied criticism that Mr. Hoover did not do all in his power to suppress what was being done to his profit; but he blasts forever the curious claim that Alfred E. Smith injected the religious issue into the 1928 campaign. It is a fact that many, even Catholics, are not even yet aware of

the vast extent of the anti-Catholic propaganda in that year; to them this book will come as a revelation. Mr. Williams' opinion—he admits that only opinions are possible in the case—that the religious issue was not the dominant one in the 1928 campaign, will probably be controverted, especially in view of events since the book was written. Because of the great number of names and places mentioned, an index would have much improved this book, which has great value as it is, and makes most absorbing reading. If it discourages those who imagine that all's well with the world for Catholics, it will strengthen them with a greater sense of reality.

W. P.

Regulation of Public Utilities. By CASSIUS M. CLAY. New York: Henry Holt and Company. \$3.50.

The regulation of public utilities and the method of doing so has been a vexing problem ever since these utilities have assumed large proportions. The problem is rooted in their double nature as private property and public servants. As a utility they have a right to "a fair return on a fair value" and as public servants they have duties to the consuming public. How these rights and duties are to be reconciled is the crux of the question. The author of this book develops the question with more or less clearness and cites numerous documents and passages from the writings of law and utility experts. In the first part he treats of rate regulation in general; in the second part of national vs. state regulation in interstate features, such as electric power, transportation, and distribution system in general. His leaning is apparently with big business towards the "non-interference" principle as the most salutary. Else, he thinks, the profit incentive is weakened and the investment of capital made unattractive. There seems to be agreement on the principle of a "fair return for a fair value," but judicial opinions differ widely as to the principles by which it ought to be measured. Is the reproduction cost or the prudent investment cost or the earning capacity to be of predominant weight? Reproduction cost estimates become as nebulous when studied as an early morning fog on a lake in Maine. The author suggests that a solution of the present difficulties may be facilitated by a frank recognition by all of the separate economic and legal phases of the problem, the latter only to be determined by the Supreme Courts, the former by the legislature. After all has been said it remains true that the much-mulcted and helpless community needs protection whether this comes from the legislature or the courts.

P. H. B.

Ireland in America. By EDWARD F. ROBERTS. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2.50.

The thesis put forward in this volume is important for our national history. It is important because of what it asserts and equally important because of what it denies. The Irish contribution to the making of the United States, in the preparatory period of the Colonies, in the Revolutionary decade, and in the early years of Independence, has been consistently neglected, minimized and misrepresented. The English contribution has been, on the other hand, consistently exaggerated and idealized by our historians who have been, almost wholly, English-Americans. That designation falls with a strange sound, but it has as much cause for use, perhaps more cause in the matter of truth, as the naming of the other dominant racial groups as Irish-Americans and German-Americans. Mr. Roberts treats of another designation of false import in his first chapter: that of Scotch-Irish. This designation is as baseless in fact as it is malicious in purpose. The Scotch-Irish-American has never existed except in the most minute percentage; the Scotch-Irish is practically non-existent in Ireland, and was never a term of praise. The so-called Scotch-Irish are the Protestants who are as proud of being Irish, solely and simply, as the Irish Catholics. Mr. Roberts is not far wrong when he asserts that the Colonists were one-third Irish and only one-half English, that the Irish element made up one-half of the Continental Army in the revolt from England, and that the greatest obstacle to Washington's success in the War was the fact that the majority of the English colonists were Tories, and the

further fact that they used fair and foul means to prevent the break with their mother-country. Mr. Roberts is correct in his statements; unfortunately, however, he has omitted to list his authorities and to order his information in a scholarly manner. His earlier chapters, up to the time of the new Irish influx in the middle of the last century, are of far more value and interest than his record of the Irish during the Civil War and the years since then. As a popular presentation of the story of the influence of the Irish race and of individual Irishmen in the development of the United States, the volume is to be commended. It could have been made more impressive, however, if it had incorporated more scholarship in its popular presentation. F. X. T.

John Hanson. Our First President. By SEYMOUR WEMYSS SMITH. New York: Brewer, Warren and Putnam. \$2.00.

This is a very attractively written book, filled with a mass of forgotten, or rather neglected, history that is both interesting and instructive. A graceful portrait of John Hanson adorns the opening page, and five photostat copies of important letters are interspersed throughout the body of the text. The author's main contention, however, that John Hanson was the First President of the United States is scarcely susceptible of sound support. It bears a striking resemblance to the case of David B. Atchison, who, according to the claim of Missouri, was President from midnight March 3 to noon March 5, 1849. In testimony of its belief in this theory the Missouri Legislature appropriated the sum of \$15,000 for the erection of a statue commemorative of the supposed event. In the "Articles of Confederation" we find a provision authorizing "The United States in Congress assembled"—"to appoint one of their number to preside, provided that no person be allowed to serve in the office of president more than one year in any term of three years." Such an appointed officer is clearly president of the body over which he presides, but by no stretch of the imagination can his position be exalted into the dignity of President of the United States. Such an investment of rank and authority was never contemplated in the structure of the "Articles of Confederation." This fact, however, in no way diminishes the luster of John Hanson's eminent qualities and worth. And his biographer is deserving of much praise for the excellent manner in which he presents the persevering patriotism and righteous virtue of his hero. Studies and research of this character are not without merit; they deserve encouragement. M. J. S.

Modern India. Edited by SIR JOHN CUMMING. London: Oxford University Press. \$1.50.

Books dealing with conditions in India now so abound that they vie in number with any subject of popular interest. Many of them as well will compete favorably for intrinsic worth where style, interest, or information are the criterion. For reliable information on such topics as: "The Machinery of Government," "Law and Order,"—"The Country, Peoples, Languages and Creed,"—"Education,"—"Peasants, Landowners and the State," this latest cooperative study, "Modern India," is invaluable. Written by men all of whom save one, have served in India for a number of years, these various topics comprising "Modern India" are the reports of official experts. The book treats of conditions rather than events and may well be termed: "England's Apologia for Her Dominance in India." It contains an excellent map of India, indicating the Indian States and the parts of the country under British Rule. R. P. L.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Biographies.—"Native Stock" (Macmillan. \$2.50) appears to be largely a by-product of Mr. Arthur Pound's recent work, "Johnson of the Mohawks." It consists of six short biographies of New Englanders of the eighteenth century, none of whom are of great importance. The name of the volume means little, though there purports to be the thread of the development of American ideals running through the six sketches. William Pepperrell, born in 1696, wealthy Maine merchant and militia officer is the subject

of the first biography. John Bradstreet, little-known colonel in the colonial wars; Ephraim Williams, trader and Indian fighter; the restless and dishonest Robert Rogers; James Clinton, general in the Revolutionary war; and the energetic merchant and promoter Elkanah Watson are the other subjects.

Mahatma Gandhi is a name that has become very familiar to us all due to the newspaper accounts of his dealings with the British officials of South Africa and the part he played in the "Passive-Resistance Movement" staged by the Indians after the enactment of the Asiatic Law in the Transvaal. His book "Gandhi at Work" (Macmillan. \$2.50) may have been written by him simply with the intent of preserving a diary of his doings while the struggle was on, or it may have been written for the purpose of putting before the public his version of the grievances of the Indians in South Africa against the English Government; realizing that for the most part, accounts in English-speaking communities at least, would be written from the English viewpoint. However Gandhi's book must necessarily elicit fair treatment from his readers, and doubtless will gain for him and his people much sympathy; for his book is more the impartial account of a disinterested person than the story of the leader of the Indian faction and he is so ready to render praise and gratitude to the English Government where he judges such to be due.

Spiritual Reading.—In "Christ's Twelve" (Bruce. \$1.25), which appeared originally as a series of papers in the *Sign*, Father F. J. Mueller has produced a book of spiritual reading which is interesting, accurate and helpful. Of course comparatively little is known about the Apostles, but the information gleaned from New Testament references is here meditatively woven together by a keen analyst of character, under such chapter headings as "Peter, Man of Impulse" and "Paul, a Man's Man." The thoughtful study of Christ's Twelve, human beings like ourselves, but by the grace of God saints, will bring the reader closer to Him Who is the Master of us all.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

AFFAIR AT TIDEWAY, THE. Elizabeth Alden Heath. \$2.00. Crowell.
APES OF GOD. Wyndham Lewis. \$2.00. McBride.
BACK TO PROSPERITY. Stephen Leacock. \$1.25. Macmillan.
BROTHERS. L. A. G. Strong. \$2.50. Knopf.
CARLYLE. Emery Neff. \$3.00. Norton.
CROSS-ANNUNCIATION, THE. Rev. A. M. Mayer, O.S.M. Sanctuary of Our Sorrowful Mother, Portland, Oregon.
DAVID'S DAY. Denis Mackail. \$2.50. Houghton, Mifflin.
DEVIL IN THE BELFRY, THE. Russell Thorndike. \$2.00. Dial.
ENGLAND MUDDLES THROUGH. Harold E. Scarborough. \$1.75. Macmillan.
ENGLISH SHAKESPEARIAN CRITICISM IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. Herbert S. Robinson. \$3.50. H. W. Wilson.
ESSAYS ON THE LOGIC OF BEING. Francis S. Haserot. \$4.00. Macmillan.
FORGOTTEN FRONTIERS. Translated and edited by Alfred Barnaby Thomas. \$5.00. University of Oklahoma Press.
GEORGE WASHINGTON. N. C. W. C. Dept. of Education.
GERBE DE MERVEILLES. Dom G. Mcunier. 7 francs. Tequi.
HINDENBURG. T. R. Ybarr. \$3.00. Dufield and Green.
HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES, Vol. XXI. Edited by Thomas F. Meehan. U. S. Catholic Historical Society.
HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF BALTIMORE, A. Rev. Peter Guilday. \$3.00. Macmillan.
HOLY PRAYERS IN A HORSE'S EAR. Kathleen Tamagawa. \$3.00. Long and Smith.
HOUSE OF WIVES, THE. Elizabeth H. Herbert. \$2.00. Farrar and Rinehart.
"I SAW HITLER." Dorothy Thompson. \$1.00. Farrar and Rinehart.
KAMONGO. Homer W. Smith. \$2.00. Viking Press.
KINGDOM IN THE SKY, THE. Alice Brown. \$2.50. Macmillan.
KNIGHT OF THE CROSS, A. Helen Grace Smith. \$3.00. Bruce.
LYRA MYSTICA. Edited by Charles Carroll Albertson. \$3.00. Macmillan.
MESSAGE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL, THE. Elbert Russell. \$1.50. Cokesbury Press.
MISS ALADDIN. Christine Whiting Parmenter. \$2.00. Crowell.
MR. GRESHAM AND OLYMPUS. Norman Lindsay. \$2.00. Farrar and Rinehart.
MODERN TOWER OF BABEL, THE, AND OTHER ESSAYS. Rev. William J. V. Boyle. \$2.00. Peter Reilly.
MYSTICISM AND DEMOCRACY IN THE ENGLISH COMMONWEALTH. Rufus M. Jones. \$2.00. Harvard University Press.
OWL'S WARNING, THE. Herman Landon. \$2.00. Liveright.
PLAY-BOY. Elizabeth Jordan. \$2.00. Century.
RAIN ON THE ROOF. Kay Lipke. \$2.00. Dial.
RANGE ROBBERS, THE. Oliver Strange. \$2.00. Dial.
RED DUSK. Celeste Dunbar Lindsay. \$2.00. Dial.
RIGHT OF WAY. Harold Bindloss. \$2.00. Stokes.
ROLL-TOP DESK MYSTERY, THE. Carolyn Wells. \$2.00. Lippincott.
SAINT FRANCIS XAVIER. Margaret Yeo. \$2.25. Macmillan.
SEEKING LONDON. E. M. Newman. \$5.00. Funk and Wagnalls.
THREE MEDIEVAL CENTURIES OF LITERATURE IN ENGLAND. Charles Sears Baldwin. \$1.75. Little, Brown.
VEIL IS LIFTED, THE. Rev. Joseph B. Code. \$1.25. Bruce.
WEDDING-CHEST MYSTERY, THE. A. Fielding. \$2.00. Kinsey.
WHO ARE THESE FRENCH? Friedrich Sieburg. \$2.50. Macmillan.

A Buried Treasure. Folkhouse. The Brontës Went to Woolworth's. The Altar of Sacrifice.

"A Buried Treasure" (The Viking Press. \$2.50), by Elizabeth Madox Roberts is interesting reading, in so far as it reveals an accomplished genre writer again concerned with her specialty. The scene, of course, is rural Kentucky. A man and his wife discover on their farm a pot of gold. How this discovery affects them, how it affects the community, Miss Roberts seems to delight in telling. Into the comic complications brought about by the pot of gold she introduces other stories as well, about various men and women in the community: glimpses at times pathetic, at times amusing of that life about which she can write so finely. Miss Roberts covers less space and less time than she covered in "The Great Meadow." In this novel she is in a simpler, but no less interesting mood. Her art is so fine that its beauties seem to have escaped the critics who rhapsodize so easily over the inferior work of other writers.

"This is the love romance of two charming young people," we read on the jacket of "Folkhouse" (Appleton. \$2.00), by Ruth Sawyer. The measure of one's reaction to the romance and the people will depend on one's conceptions of romance and charm, of course. The book is so innocent, so brave in its naivete, that it is almost an anachronism in these parlous times when the domesticity it idealizes is an object of bemused contempt. Full of romance and full of charm, then, is "Folkhouse." And what if it is delicious, like the plays in which Janet Gaynor appears: who could want to carp at such things? The fact that there is an immense audience for Miss Gaynor ought to hearten Miss Sawyer, who is simply a reincarnation of the spirit of Gene Stratton Porter brought up to date.

If Corey Ford were to write with the whimsy of Barrie or Milne, he might, with some help of genius, achieve an intriguing, if slightly mad, narrative such as Rachel Ferguson presents in "The Brontës Went to Woolworth's" (Dutton. \$2.50). As the title, so also the book is rather dizzy, deliciously so. If you like a book with several chortles per page, which you will not want to put aside unfinished, and to which you will return for an antidote against depression, here is that book. There are a few small insects in the unguent; but they can be excused for the eminently enjoyable charm of the compound. Mrs. Carne and her three daughters are the merry central group, whose favorite game is a "make-believe," in which they select some well-known figure, whose name and likeness appear frequently in the press, and build up an imaginary life for him in which they are included. He is invited to lunch, they have phone calls from him, they discuss his habits and preferences. . . and, wish they knew him. One day, the eldest daughter, Deirdre, meets, really and truly in the flesh, the family's latest "crush" and their theories are put to the test. Read it and laugh. It's healthy and a sure cure for depression. And it well deserves the enthusiastic welcome it has received.

So many of our modern novels reveal a philosophy of life that is sensuous and a background that is pagan that one who still cherishes the sacred verities of life will find real and lasting pleasure in the strong portrayal of a very human but sublime woman in "The Altar of Sacrifice" (Longmans. \$2.50) by Isabel C. Clarke. Lesley Marvell was suddenly transformed most unexpectedly from a poor, struggling artist to a lady of wealth. But her grandfather from whom the fortune was derived had been a hater of everything Catholic, and a clause in his will precluded any heir from ever embracing that Faith. Lesley's curiosity is aroused by this very restriction, and she goes to Italy to see for herself what this religion must be that arouses such loyalties and such hatreds. She is treated to a marvelous object lesson in sacrifice in the person of Piers Imray, a friend she meets there. Later she is converted, renounces her estate, returns to Italy, and finds her true lover. Throughout her romance, the interlocking threads of a delightful episode between Pearl Draper and Alec Corrie, are cleverly woven. The story is full of beautiful situations, the characters are natural and very human: the style is pleasing.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

"Fifteen-Minute Masses"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The complete withdrawal by Dr. Johannes Pinsk of the statement that in the United States there are churches announcing "fifteen-minute Masses" is a gratifying outcome of the protest you printed on December 26. Your readers will be pleased to learn that the editor of the *Schönere Zukunft* of Vienna has printed a similar retraction and announced that it would also appear in the February number of the *Liturgische Zeitschrift*.

Will you allow me to note that the protests against the hurried celebrations of Mass, made by almost all who have written to you or to me personally on this topic, whilst laudable, are beside the second issue which I raised and which Dr. Pinsk does not yet seem to recognize, namely, what I called "gullibility"—the readiness manifested by some Catholics, not merely in Germany but also in other European countries, to credit any outlandish yarn about their fellow-Catholics in this country? One had hoped that the generosity displayed by our Catholic people towards the seminaries and priests of Europe during and after the World War would have borne more lasting fruit.

Even some who were America's guests at the Chicago Eucharistic Congress seemed unwilling to acknowledge what they saw with their own eyes, the faith and the fervor of our Catholics. How different this attitude from the frank acknowledgment of Father Michael Hofmann, S.J., after his return to Innsbruck! Writing of his experience in 1926, he said in substance:

When I set out for America, knowing, as I did, the seminarians from the United States in the College at Innsbruck, I thought to myself, "Perhaps I shall find in their land a faith like that we have in Tirol." But when I reached Chicago and beheld the immense crowds of men at Confession and Communion in every church and when I was one of the 250,000 men in the Stadium on Holy Name night, I said to myself: "Would to God we had such faith in Tirol!"

When our European brethren wish to mention Catholics in the United States, why don't they praise the loving loyalty of our men or women to the Holy Father? Or the generosity with which our poorer people bear the great burden of providing for all Church needs and for Catholic education? Or the zeal of our Religious Brothers and Sisters in the schools? Or the ready obedience to the decrees on early and frequent Communion? Or the innocence and holiness of our young men as well as our young women, thousands of whom in our large cities have been to Holy Communion every Sunday and every First Friday since they made their first Communion?

New York.

JOHN CORBETT, S.J.

How to Help Deaf Mutes

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It is estimated that there are 25,000 deaf mutes of Catholic birth in the United States, and that about two-thirds of these are lost to the Church. Very little, apparently, is being done for them.

A highly practical and immediate way the deaf mutes can be helped is by means of dactylology, or the sign language. A class of six dactylologists was established here at the St. Paul Seminary last year. Unlimited good might accrue to our deaf mutes if other seminaries and institutions of learning would take up the study. Priests should be anxious to avail themselves of means by which to keep these unfortunate people within the fold of the Church. Why not begin now by preparing seminarians for this important apostolate? Laymen, too, might bring cheer and even salvation to many a deaf mute. Hence the need of sign study especially in colleges. Perhaps sociology classes or religious societies, e. g., the St. Vincent de Paul Society, might make it a specific phase of their work.

St. Paul.

JEROME B. POKORNY.